arXiv:0808.2998v1 [math.RT] 21 Aug 2008

NILPOTENT ORBITS IN THE DUAL OF CLASSICAL LIE ALGEBRAS IN CHARACTERISTIC 2 AND THE SPRINGER CORRESPONDENCE

TING XUE

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, let $\mathbf{k}$ be a field of characteristic 2. Let G be a classical group over $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. Let $\mathfrak{g}^*$ be the dual vector space of $\mathfrak{g}$. Fix a Borel subgroup B and a maximal torus $T \subset B$ of G. Let $B = TU$ be the Levi decomposition of B. Let $\mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{n}$ be the Lie algebra of B, T and U respectively. We have a natural action of G on $\mathfrak{g}^*$, $g.\xi(x) = \xi(\mathrm{Ad}(g)^{-1}x)$ for $g \in G, \xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ and $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mathfrak{n}' = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* | \xi(\mathfrak{b}) = 0\}$. An element ξ in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is called nilpotent if $G.\xi \cap \mathfrak{n}' \neq \emptyset$([4]). We classify the nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ under the action of G in the cases when $\mathbf{k}$ is algebraically closed and when $\mathbf{k}$ is a finite field $\mathbf{F}_q$. In particular, we obtain the number of nilpotent orbits over $\mathbf{F}_q$ and the structure of groups of components of the centralizers.

Let G_{ad} be an adjoint algebraic group of type B, C or D over $\mathbf{k}$ (assume $\mathbf{k}$ algebraically closed) and $\mathfrak{g}_{ad}$ be the Lie algebra of G_{ad}. In [7], we have constructed a Springer correspondence for $\mathfrak{g}_{ad}$(see the references therein). In Section 5, we use the Deligne-Fourier transform to construct a Springer correspondence for $\mathfrak{g}^*_{ad}$. Let $\mathfrak{A}'_{ad}$ be the set of all pairs $(\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}')$ where c' is a nilpotent G_{ad}-orbit in $\mathfrak{g}^*_{ad}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ is an irreducible G_{ad}-equivariant local system on c' (up to isomorphism). We construct a bijective map from the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of the Weyl group of G_{ad} to the set $\mathfrak{A}'_{ad}$.

2. SYMPLECTIC GROUP

2.1. Let V be a vector space of dimension $2n$ over $\mathbf{k}$ equipped with a non-degenerate symplectic form $\beta : V \times V \to \mathbf{k}$. The symplectic group is defined as $G = Sp(2n) = \{g \in GL(V) \mid \beta(gv, gw) = \beta(v, w), \forall\ v, w \in V\}$ and its Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}(2n) = \{x \in \mathfrak{gl}(V) \mid \beta(xv, w) + \beta(v, xw) = 0, \forall\ v, w \in V\}$. With respect to a suitable basis, we can assume $\beta(v, w) = v^tSw$, where $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{n\times n} \\ I_{n\times n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Let ξ be an element of $\mathfrak{g}^*$. There exists $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ such that $\xi(x) = \mathrm{tr}(Xx)$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. We define $T_\xi = X + SX^tS$ and define a quadratic form $\alpha_\xi : V \to \mathbf{k}$ by $\alpha_\xi(v) = v^tSXv = \beta(v, Xv)$.

Lemma 2.1. *T_ξ and α_ξ are well-defined.*

Proof. We need to show that the definitions of T_ξ and α_ξ do not depend on the choice of X. We have $\mathrm{tr}(Xx) = \mathrm{tr}(X'x)$, $\forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$, if and only if $X + X' = \begin{pmatrix} (Z_1)_{n\times n} & Z_2 \\ Z_3 & Z_1^t \end{pmatrix}$, where $Z_2^t = Z_2, Z_3^t = Z_3$ and Z_2, Z_3 have zero diagonals. This is true if and only if $\beta((X + X')v, v) = 0$, $\forall\ v \in V$. Thus α_ξ is well-defined. Now

$\mathrm{tr}(Xx) = \mathrm{tr}(X'x)$, $\forall\, x \in \mathfrak{g}$, implies $(X+X')^tS+S(X+X') = 0$, which is equivalent to $X + SX^tS = X' + SX'^tS$. Hence T_ξ is well-defined. □

Given $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, we denote by $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ the vector space V equipped with the symplectic form β and the quadratic form α_ξ. Let β_ξ be the symmetric bilinear form associated to α_ξ, namely, $\beta_\xi(v, w) = \alpha_\xi(v + w) + \alpha_\xi(v) + \alpha_\xi(w)$, $v, w \in V_\xi$.

Definition 2.2. Given $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, we say that $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ is equivalent to $(V_\zeta, \beta, \alpha_\zeta)$ if there exists a vector space isomorphism $g : V_\xi \to V_\zeta$ such that $\beta(gv, gw) = \beta(v, w)$ and $\alpha_\zeta(gv) = \alpha_\xi(v)$ for all $v, w \in V_\xi$.

Lemma 2.3. *Two elements $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $\alpha_\xi(g^{-1}v) = \alpha_\zeta(v)$, $\forall\ v \in V$.*

Proof. The two elements ξ, ζ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $g.\xi(x) = \xi(g^{-1}xg) = \zeta(x)$, $\forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$. Assume $\xi(x) = \mathrm{tr}(X_\xi x)$ and $\zeta(x) = \mathrm{tr}(X_\zeta x)$. Then by same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.1, $g.\xi(x) = \zeta(x), \forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$, if and only if $\beta(gX_\xi g^{-1}v, v) + \beta(X_\zeta v, v) = 0$ if and only if $\alpha_\xi(g^{-1}v) = \alpha_\zeta(v)$, $\forall\ v \in V$. □

Corollary 2.4. *Two elements $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ is equivalent to $(V_\zeta, \beta, \alpha_\zeta)$.*

From now on assume $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is nilpotent. Then it is easily seen that T_ξ is a nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{gl}(V_\xi)$. Let $A = \mathbf{k}[[t]]$ be the ring of formal power series in the indeterminate t. We consider V_ξ as an A-module by $(\sum a_k t^k)v = \sum a_k T_\xi^k v$. Let E be the vector space spanned by the linear functionals $t^{-k} : A \to \mathbf{k}$, $\sum a_i t^i \mapsto a_k$, $k \geq 0$. Let E_0 and E_1 be the subspace $\sum \mathbf{k}t^{-2k}$ and $\sum \mathbf{k}t^{-2k-1}$ respectively. Denote $\pi_i : E \to E_i$, $i = 0, 1$ the projections. The vector space E is considered as an A-module by $(au)(b) = u(ab)$ for $a, b \in A, u \in E$. Define $\varphi : V \times V \to E, \psi : V \to E_1$ and $\varphi_\xi : V \times V \to E, \psi_\xi : V \to E_0$ by

$$\varphi(v, w) = \sum_{k\geq 0} \beta(t^k v, w)t^{-k},\ \ \psi(v) = \sum_{k\geq 0} \beta(t^{k+1}v, t^k v)t^{-2k-1}$$

and

$$\varphi_\xi(v, w) = \sum_{k\geq 0} \beta_\xi(t^k v, w)t^{-k},\ \ \psi_\xi(v) = \sum_{k\geq 0} \alpha_\xi(t^k v)t^{-2k}.$$

Notice that we have $\beta(T_\xi v, v) = v^tX^tSv+v^tSXSSv = 0$ and $\beta_\xi(T_\xi v, v) = \beta(T_\xi v, Xv)+\beta(v, XT_\xi v) = \beta(T_\xi v, T_\xi v) = 0$. By Proposition 2.7 in [2], we can identify $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ with $(V_\xi, \varphi, \psi, \varphi_\xi, \psi_\xi)$. The mappings φ, ψ and φ_ξ, ψ_ξ satisfy the following properties([2]):

(i) The maps $\varphi(\cdot, w)$ and $\varphi_\xi(\cdot, w)$ are A-linear for every $w \in V_\xi$.
(ii) $\varphi(v, w) = \varphi(w, v)$, $\varphi_\xi(v, w) = \varphi_\xi(w, v)$ for all $v, w \in V_\xi$.
(iii) $\varphi(v, v) = \psi(v)$, $\varphi_\xi(v, v) = 0$ for all $v \in V_\xi$.
(vi) $\psi(v + w) = \psi(v) + \psi(w)$, $\psi_\xi(v + w) = \psi_\xi(v) + \psi_\xi(w) + \pi_0(\varphi_\xi(v, w))$ for all $v, w \in V_\xi$.
(v) $\psi(av) = a^2\psi(v)$,$\psi_\xi(av) = a^2\psi_\xi(v)$ for all $v \in V_\xi$, $a \in A$.

Following [2], we call $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ a form module and $(V_\xi, \varphi, \psi, \varphi_\xi, \psi_\xi)$ an abstract form module. Corollary 2.4 says that classifying the nilpotent G-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is equivalent to classifying the equivalence classes of the form modules $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$. In the following we classify the form modules $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ via the identification with $(V_\xi, \varphi, \psi, \varphi_\xi, \psi_\xi)$. Define $p(V_\xi) = p(T_\xi)$ to be the partition associated to T_ξ via

Jordan normal form. Define an index function $\chi_{V_\xi} : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N}$ for $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$ by $\chi_{V_\xi}(m) = \min\{i \geq 0 | T_\xi^m v = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha_\xi(T_\xi^i v) = 0\}$. Define $\mu(V_\xi)$ to be the minimal integer $m \geq 0$ with $T_\xi^m V_\xi = 0$. For $v \in V_\xi$, we define $\mu(v) = \mu(Av)$. Similarly we define $\mu(E)$ for E and $\mu(u)$ for $u \in E$.

Lemma 2.5. *We have* $\psi(v) = 0$ *and* $\varphi_\xi(v, w) = t\varphi(v, w)$ *for all* $v, w \in V_\xi$.

Proof. The first assertion follows from $\beta(T_\xi v, v) = 0, \forall\ v \in V_\xi$. The second assertion follows from $\beta_\xi(T_\xi^k v, w) = \beta(T_\xi^{k+1} v, w)$. In fact, we have $\beta_\xi(v, w) = \beta(v, Xw) + \beta(w, Xv) = \beta(v, T_\xi w)$. □

We consider the orthogonal decomposition of V_ξ with respect to φ, which is also an orthogonal decomposition of V_ξ with respect to φ_ξ since $\varphi(v, w) = 0$ implies $\varphi_\xi(v, w) = 0$. Recall an orthogonal decomposition of V is an expression of V as a direct sum $V = \sum_{i=1}^r V_i$ of mutually orthogonal submodules V_i. A form module V is called indecomposable if $V \neq 0$ and for every orthogonal decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ we have $V_1 = 0$ or $V_2 = 0$. Every form module V has some orthogonal decomposition $V = \sum_{i=1}^r V_i$ in indecomposable submodules $V_1, V_2, ..., V_r$.

We first classify the indecomposable modules (with respect to φ) that appear in the orthogonal decompositions of form modules $(V_\xi, \beta, \alpha_\xi)$. Let $(V_\xi, \varphi, \psi, \varphi_\xi, \psi_\xi)$ be an indecomposable module, where $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is nilpotent. Since $\psi(v) = 0$, for all $v \in V_\xi$, by the classification of modules (V_ξ, φ, ψ), there exist v_1, v_2 such that $V_\xi = Av_1 \oplus Av_2$ with $\mu(v_1) = \mu(v_2) = m$ and $\varphi(v_1, v_2) = t^{1-m}$ (see [2], notice that β is non-degenerate on V_ξ). Denote $\psi_\xi(v_1) = \Psi_1$, $\psi_\xi(v_2) = \Psi_2$ and $\varphi_\xi(v_1, v_2) = t^{2-m} = \Phi_\xi$.

2.2. In this subsection assume $\mathbf{k}$ is algebraically closed.

Proposition 2.6. *The indecomposable modules are* $W_l(m) = Av_1 \oplus Av_2$, $[\frac{m}{2}] \leq l \leq m$ *with* $\mu(v_1) = \mu(v_2) = m$, $\psi_\xi(v_1) = t^{2-2l}$, $\psi_\xi(v_2) = 0$ *and* $\varphi(v_1, v_2) = t^{1-m}$. *We have* $\chi_{W_l(m)} = [m; l]$, *where* $[m; l] : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Z}$ *is defined by* $[m; l](k) = \max\{0, \min\{k - m + l, l\}\}$.

Proof. Assume $\mu(\Psi_1) \geq \mu(\Psi_2)$. Let $v_2' = v_2 + av_1$. The equation $\psi_\xi(v_2') = \Psi_2 + a^2\Psi_1 + \pi_0(a\Phi_\xi) = 0$ has solution for a, hence can assume $\Psi_2 = 0$. Assume $\Psi_1 = \sum_{i=0}^l a_i t^{-2i}$, $a_i \in \mathbf{k}, a_l \neq 0$. Let $v_1' = av_1$, $a \in A$, can take a invertible in A such that $\psi_\xi(v_1') = t^{-2l}$. Let $v_2'' = a^{-1}v_2'$. One verifies that $\psi_\xi(v_1') = t^{-2l}$, $\psi_\xi(v_2'') = 0$ and $\varphi(v_1', v_2'') = t^{1-m}$. Furthermore, we can assume $[m/2] - 1 \leq l \leq m - 1$. In fact, we have $l \leq m - 1$ since $t^m v = 0, \forall\ v \in V$; if $l < [\frac{m}{2}] - 1$, let $v_1' = v_1 + t^{m-2l-2}v_2 + t^{m-2[\frac{m}{2}]}v_2$, then $\psi_\xi(v_1') = t^{-2([\frac{m}{2}]-1)}$ and $\varphi(v_1', v_2) = t^{1-m}$. One can verify that the modules $W_l(m)$, $[m/2] \leq l \leq m$ exist and are not equivalent to each other. Moreover, $\chi_{W_l(m)} = [m; l]$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Assume* $m_1 \geq m_2$.

(i) *If* $l_1 < l_2$, *then* $W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}(m_2) \cong W_{l_2}(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}(m_2)$.

(ii) *If* $m_1 - l_1 < m_2 - l_2$, *then* $W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}(m_2) \cong W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus W_{m_2 - m_1 + l_1}(m_2)$.

Proof. Assume $W_{l_i}(m_i) = Av_i \oplus Aw_i$ with $\psi_\xi(v_i) = t^{2-2l_i}$, $\psi_\xi(w_i) = 0$ and $\varphi(v_i, w_j) = \delta_{i,j} t^{1-m_i}$, $\varphi(v_i, v_j) = \varphi(w_i, w_j) = 0$, $i, j = 1, 2$. Let $\tilde{v}_1 = v_1 + (1 + t^{l_2 - l_1})v_2$, $\tilde{w}_1 = w_1$, $\tilde{v}_2 = v_2$, $\tilde{w}_2 = w_2 + (t^{m_1 - m_2} + t^{m_1 - l_1 - m_2 + l_2})w_1$. Then we have $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_i) = t^{2-2l_2}$, $\psi_\xi(\tilde{w}_i) = 0$ and $\varphi(\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{w}_j) = \delta_{i,j} t^{1-m_i}$, $\varphi(\tilde{v}_i, \tilde{v}_j) = \varphi(\tilde{w}_i, \tilde{w}_j) = 0$, $i, j = 1, 2$. This proves (i). (ii) is proved entirely similarly.

□

By Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, for every module V, there exists a unique sequence of modules $W_{l_i}(m_i)$ such that V is equivalent to $W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}(m_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}(m_s)$, $[\frac{m_i}{2}] \leq l_i \leq m_i$, $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_s$, $l_1 \geq l_2 \geq \cdots \geq l_s$ and $m_1 - l_1 \geq m_2 - l_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_s - l_s$. It follows that $p(V_\xi) = m_1^2 \cdots m_s^2$ and $\chi_{V_\xi}(k) = \sup_i \chi_{W_{l_i}(m_i)}(k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\chi_V(m_i) = \chi_{W_{l_i}(m_i)} = l_i$. Thus we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.8. *Two nilpotent elements $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if T_ξ, T_ζ are conjugate in $GL(V)$ and $\chi(V_\xi) = \chi(V_\zeta)$.*

It follows that the nilpotent orbits are characterized by symbols

$$(m_1)^2_{l_1} \cdots (m_s)^2_{l_s},$$

where $[\frac{m_i}{2}] \leq l_i \leq m_i$, $m_i \geq m_{i+1}$, $l_i \geq l_{i+1}$ and $m_i - l_i \geq m_{i+1} - l_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$.

We associate to the orbit $(m_1)^2_{l_1} \cdots (m_s)^2_{l_s}$ a pair of partitions $(l_1, \ldots, l_s)(m_1 - l_1, \ldots, m_s - l_s)$. This way we construct a bijection from the set of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ to the set $\{(\mu, \nu) || \mu| + |\nu| = n, \nu_i \leq \mu_i + 1\}$, which has cardinality $p_2(n) - p_2(n-2)$.

2.3. In this subsection, let $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{F}_q$. Let $G(\mathbf{F}_q)$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)$ be the fixed points of a Frobenius map $\mathfrak{F}_q$ relative to $\mathbf{F}_q$ on G, $\mathfrak{g}$. We study the nilpotent $G(\mathbf{F}_q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$. Fix $\delta \notin \{x^2 + x | x \in \mathbf{F}_q\}$. We have the following statements whose proofs are entirely similar to those of [7]. For completeness, we also include the proofs here.

Proposition 2.9. *The indecomposable modules over $\boldsymbol{F}_q$ are*

(i) *$W_l^0(m) = Av_1 \oplus Av_2$, $(m-1)/2 \leq l \leq m$ with $\psi_\xi(v_1) = t^{2-2l}$, $\psi_\xi(v_2) = 0$ and $\varphi(v_1, v_2) = t^{1-m}$;*

(ii) *$W_l^\delta(m) = Av_1 \oplus Av_2$, $(m-1)/2 < l < m$ with $\psi_\xi(v_1) = t^{2-2l}$, $\psi_\xi(v_2) = \delta t^{-2(m-1-l)}$ and $\varphi(v_1, v_2) = t^{1-m}$.*

Proof. Let $V_\xi = Av_1 \oplus Av_2$ be an indecomposable module as in the last paragraph of subsection 2.1. We have $\Phi_\xi = t^{2-m}$. Can assume $\mu(\Psi_1) \geq \mu(\Psi_2)$. We have the following cases:

Case 1: $\Psi_1 = \Psi_2 = 0$. Let $\tilde{v}_1 = v_1 + t^{m-2[\frac{m}{2}]} v_2, \tilde{v}_2 = v_2$, then we have $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_1) = t^{2-2[\frac{m}{2}]}$, $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_2) = 0$ and $\varphi(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2) = t^{1-m}$.

Case 2: $\Psi_1 \neq 0$, $\Psi_2 = 0$. Can find $a, b \in A$ invertible, such that $\psi_\xi(av_1) = t^{-2k}, \psi_\xi(bv_2) = 0, \varphi(av_1, bv_2) = t^{1-m}$. Hence can assume $\Psi_1 = t^{-2k}$ where $k \leq m-1$. If $k < [\frac{m}{2}] - 1$, let $\tilde{v}_1 = v_1 + t^{m-2[\frac{m}{2}]} v_2 + t^{m-2k-2} v_2$, $\tilde{v}_2 = v_2$; otherwise, let $\tilde{v}_1 = v_1$, $\tilde{v}_2 = v_2$. Then we get $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_1) = t^{-2k}$, $[\frac{m}{2}] - 1 \leq k \leq m-1$, $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_2) = 0$, $\varphi(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2) = t^{1-m}$.

Case 3: $\Psi_1 \neq 0$, $\Psi_2 \neq 0$. Can find $a, b \in A$ invertible, such that $\psi_\xi(av_1) = t^{-2l_1}, \varphi(av_1, bv_2) = t^{1-m}$. Hence can assume $\Psi_1 = t^{-2l_1}$, $\Psi_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{l_2} a_i t^{-2i}$ with $l_2 \leq l_1 \leq m-1$. Let $\tilde{v}_2 = v_2 + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i t^i v_1$. Assume $l_1 < \frac{m-2}{2}$, then $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_2) = 0$ has solution for x_i's and we get to Case 2. Assume $l_1 \geq \frac{m-2}{2}$. If $a_{m-l_1-2} \in \{x^2 + x | x \in \mathbf{F}_q\}$, then $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_2) = 0$ has solution for x_i's and we get to Case 2; if $a_{m-l_1-2} \notin \{x^2 + x | x \in \mathbf{F}_q\}$, then $\psi_\xi(\tilde{v}_2) = \delta t^{-2(m-l_1-2)}$ has solution for x_i's.

Summarizing Cases 1-3, we have normalized $V_\xi = Av_1 \oplus Av_2$ with $\mu(v_1) = \mu(v_2) = m$ as follows:

(i) $(m-1)/2 \leq \chi(m) = l \leq m$, $\psi_\xi(v_1) = t^{2-2l}$, $\psi_\xi(v_2) = 0$, $\varphi(v_1, v_2) = t^{1-m}$, denote by $W_l^0(m)$.

(ii) $(m-1)/2 < \chi(m) = l < m$, $\psi_\xi(v_1) = t^{2-2l}$, $\psi_\xi(v_2) = \delta t^{-2(m-l-1)}$, $\varphi(v_1, v_2) = t^{1-m}$, denote by $W_l^\delta(m)$.

One can verify that these form modules are not equivalent to each other. $\square$

Remark 2.10. It follows that the equivalence class of the form module $W_l(m)$ over $\overline{\mathbf{F}}_q$ remains one equivalence class over $\mathbf{F}_q$ when $l = \frac{m-1}{2}$ or m and decomposes into two equivalence classes $W_l^0(m)$ and $W_l^\delta(m)$ over $\mathbf{F}_q$ otherwise.

Lemma 2.11. *Assume $m_1 \geq m_2$, $l_1 \geq l_2$ and $m_1 - l_1 \geq m_2 - l_2$.*

(i) *If $l_1 + l_2 < m_1$, then $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$, $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$, $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$ and $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ are not equivalent to each other.*

(ii) *If $l_1+l_2 \geq m_1$, then $W_{l_1}^0(m_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2) \cong W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ and $W_{l_1}^0(m_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2) \cong W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$. The two pairs are not equivalent to each other.*

Proof. We show that $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ and $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$ are equivalent if and only if $l_1 + l_2 \geq m_1$. The other statements are proved similarly. Assume the form module $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ corresponds to the nilpotent element ξ in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. Take v_1, w_1 and v_2, w_2 such that $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2) = Av_1 \oplus Aw_1 \oplus Av_2 \oplus Aw_2$ and $\psi_\xi(v_1) = t^{2-2l_1}, \psi_\xi(w_1) = 0, \varphi(v_1, w_1) = t^{1-m_1}, \psi_\xi(v_2) = t^{2-2l_2}, \psi_\xi(w_2) = \delta t^{-2(m_2-l_2-1)}, \varphi(v_2, w_2) = t^{1-m_2}, \varphi(v_1, v_2) = \varphi(v_1, w_2) = \varphi(w_1, v_2) = \varphi(w_1, w_2) = 0$. Similarly, assume the form module $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$ corresponds to the nilpotent element ξ' in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. Take v_1', w_1' and v_2', w_2' such that $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2) = Av_1' \oplus Aw_1' \oplus Av_2' \oplus Aw_2'$ and $\psi_{\xi'}(v_1') = t^{2-2l_1}, \psi_{\xi'}(w_1') = t^{-2(m_1-l_1-1)}, \varphi(v_1', w_1') = t^{1-m_1}, \psi_{\xi'}(v_2') = t^{2-2l_2}, \psi_{\xi'}(w_2') = 0, \varphi(v_2', w_2') = t^{1-m_2}, \varphi(v_1', v_2') = \varphi(v_1', w_2') = \varphi(w_1', v_2') = \varphi(w_1', w_2') = 0$.

The form modules $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ and $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$ are equivalent if and only if there exists a linear isomorphism $g : V \to V$ such that $\psi_{\xi'}(gv) = \psi_\xi(v), \varphi(gv, gw) = \varphi(v, w)$ for any $v, w \in V$. Assume

$$gv_j = \sum_{i=0}^{m_1-1} (a_{j,i}t^iv_1' + b_{j,i}t^iw_1') + \sum_{i=0}^{m_2-1} (c_{j,i}t^iv_2' + d_{j,i}t^iw_2'),$$

$$gw_j = \sum_{i=0}^{m_1-1} (e_{j,i}t^iv_1' + f_{j,i}t^iw_1') + \sum_{i=0}^{m_2-1} (g_{j,i}t^iv_2' + h_{j,i}t^iw_2'), j = 1, 2.$$

Then $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ and $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$ are equivalent if and only if the equations $\psi_{\xi'}(gv_i) = \psi_\xi(v_i), \psi_{\xi'}(gw_i) = \psi_\xi(w_i)$,$\varphi(gv_i, gv_j) = \varphi(v_i, v_j)$,$\varphi(gv_i, gw_j) = \varphi(v_i, w_j), \varphi(gw_i, gw_j) = \varphi(w_i, w_j), i, j = 1, 2$, have solutions.

If $l_1 + l_2 < m_1$, some equations are $e_{1,2l_1-m_1}^2 + e_{1,2l_1-m_1} = \delta$ (if $l_1 \neq \frac{m_1}{2}$) or $e_{1,0}^2 + e_{1,0}f_{1,0} + \delta f_{1,0}^2 = 0, a_{1,0}f_{1,0} + b_{1,0}e_{1,0} = 1$ (if $l_1 = \frac{m_1}{2}$). By the definition of δ, this has no solution for $e_{1,2l_1-m_1}$ or $a_{1,0}, b_{1,0}, e_{1,0}, f_{1,0}$, which implies that $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2)$ and $W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$ are not equivalent.

If $l_1 + l_2 \geq m_1$, let $gv_1 = v_1', gw_1 = w_1' + \sqrt{\delta}t^{l_1+l_2-m_1}v_2', gv_2 = v_2', gw_2 = w_2' + \sqrt{\delta}t^{l_1+l_2-m_2}v_1'$, and $gt^iv_j = t^igv_j, gt^iw_j = t^igw_j$, then this is a solution for the equations. It follows that $W_{l_1}^0(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(m_2) \cong W_{l_1}^\delta(m_1) \oplus W_{l_2}^0(m_2)$.

$\square$

Proposition 2.12. *The equivalence class of the module $W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}(m_s)$ over $\overline{\boldsymbol{F}}_q$ decomposes into at most 2^k equivalence classes over $\boldsymbol{F}_q$, where $k = \#\{1 \leq i \leq s | l_i + l_{i+1} < m_i$ and $l_i > \frac{m_i-1}{2}\}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.9 and Remark 2.10, it is enough to show form modules of the form $W_{l_1}^{\epsilon_1}(m_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_s}^{\epsilon_s}(m_s)$, where $\epsilon_i=0$ or δ, have at most 2^k equivalence classes. Suppose $i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_k$ are such that $1\leq i_j\leq s, l_{i_j}+l_{i_j+1}<m_{i_j},\ l_{i_j}>\frac{m_{i_j}-1}{2}, j=1,\ldots,k$. Then using Lemma 2.11 one can easily show that module of the above form is isomorphic to one of the following modules: $V_1^{\epsilon_1}\oplus\cdots\oplus V_k^{\epsilon_k}$, where $V_t^{\epsilon_t}=W^0_{l_{i_{t-1}+1}}(m_{i_{t-1}+1})\oplus\cdots\oplus W^0_{l_{i_t-1}}(m_{i_t-1})\oplus W^{\epsilon_t}_{m_{i_t}}(m_{i_t})$, $t=1,\ldots,k-1$, $i_0=0$, and $V_k=W^0_{l_{i_{k-1}+1}}(m_{i_{k-1}+1})\oplus\cdots\oplus W^{\epsilon_k}_{l_{i_k}}(m_{i_k})\oplus W^0_{l_{i_k+1}}(m_{i_k+1})\oplus\cdots\oplus W^0_{l_s}(m_s)$, $\epsilon_t=0$ or δ, $t=1,\ldots,k$. Thus proposition is proved. □

Corollary 2.13. *The nilpotent orbit* $(m_1)^2_{l_1}\cdots(m_s)^2_{l_s}$ *in* $\mathfrak{g}(\overline{\boldsymbol{F}}_q)^*$ *splits into at most* 2^k $G(\boldsymbol{F}_q)$*-orbits in* $\mathfrak{g}(\boldsymbol{F}_q)^*$.

Proposition 2.14. *The number of nilpotent* $G(\boldsymbol{F}_q)$*-orbits in* $\mathfrak{g}(\boldsymbol{F}_q)^*$ *is at most* $p_2(n)$.

Proof. Recall we have mapped the nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\overline{\mathbf{F}}_q)^*$ bijectively to the set $\{(\mu,\nu)||\mu|+|\nu|=n,\nu_i\leq\mu_i+1\}:=\Delta$. By Corollary 2.13, a nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{g}(\overline{\mathbf{F}}_q)^*$ corresponding to $(\mu,\nu)\in\Delta,\mu=(\mu_1,\mu_2,\ldots,\mu_s),\nu=(\nu_1,\nu_2,\ldots,\nu_s)$ splits into at most 2^k orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$, where $k=\#\{1\leq i\leq s|\mu_{i+1}+1\leq\nu_i<\mu_i+1\}$. We associate to the orbit 2^k pairs of partitions as follows. Suppose $r_1,r_2,...,r_k$ are such that $\mu_{r_i+1}+1\leq\nu_{r_i}<\mu_{r_i}+1, i=1,...,k$, then denote $\mu^{1,i}=(\mu_{r_{i-1}+1},\ldots,\mu_{r_i}),\nu^{1,i}=(\nu_{r_{i-1}+1},\ldots,\nu_{r_i}),\mu^{2,i}=(\nu_{r_{i-1}+1}-1,\ldots,\nu_{r_i}-1),\nu^{2,i}=(\mu_{r_{i-1}+1}+1,\ldots,\mu_{r_i}+1),i=1,\ldots,k,\mu^{k+1}=(\mu_{r_k+1},\ldots,\mu_s),\nu^{k+1}=(\nu_{r_k+1},\ldots,\nu_s)$. We associate to (μ,ν) the pairs of partitions $(\tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k},\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k})$, $\tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k}=(\mu^{\epsilon_1,1},\mu^{\epsilon_2,2},\ldots,\mu^{\epsilon_k,k},\mu^{k+1}),\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k}=(\nu^{\epsilon_1,1},\nu^{\epsilon_2,2},\ldots,\nu^{\epsilon_k,k},\nu^{k+1})$, where $\epsilon_i\in\{1,2\},i=1,\ldots,k$. Notice that the pairs of partitions $(\tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k},\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k})$ are distinct and among them only $(\mu,\nu)=(\tilde{\mu}^{1,\ldots,1},\tilde{\nu}^{1,\ldots,1})$ is in Δ. One can verify that $\{(\tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k},\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\ldots,\epsilon_k})|(\mu,\nu)\in\Delta,k=\#\{i|\mu_{i+1}+1\leq\nu_i<\mu_i+1\}\}$ is in bijection with the set $\{(\mu,\nu)||\mu|+|\nu|=n\}$, which has cardinality $p_2(n)$. It follows that the number of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$ is less that $p_2(n)$. □

3. ODD ORTHOGONAL GROUP

3.1. Let V be a vector space of dimension $2n+1$ over $\mathbf{k}$ equipped with a non-degenerate quadratic form $\alpha:V\to\mathbf{k}$. Let $\beta:V\times V\to\mathbf{k}$ be the bilinear form associated to α. The odd orthogonal group is defined as $G=O(2n+1)=\{g\in GL(V)\mid\alpha(gv)=\alpha(v),\forall\ v\in V\}$ and its Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{o}(2n+1)=\{x\in\mathfrak{gl}(V)\mid\beta(xv,v)=0,\forall\ v\in V\text{ and }\mathrm{tr}(x)=0\}$. With respect to a suitable basis, we can assume $\alpha(v)=v^tBv$ where $B=\begin{pmatrix}0&I_{n\times n}&0\\0_{n\times n}&0&0\\0&0&1\end{pmatrix}$. Thus $\beta(v,w)=v^tSw$, where $S=\begin{pmatrix}0&I_{n\times n}&0\\I_{n\times n}&0&0\\0&0&0\end{pmatrix}$. Let ξ be an element of $\mathfrak{g}^*$. There exists $\tilde{X}\in\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ such that $\xi(x)=\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}x)$ for any $x\in\mathfrak{g}$. We define $X_\xi=\tilde{X}^tS+S\tilde{X}$ and $\beta_\xi:V\times V\to\mathbf{k}$, $(v,w)\mapsto v^tX_\xi w$.

Lemma 3.1. X_ξ *and* β_ξ *are well-defined.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the definitions do not depend on the choice of $\tilde{X}$. We have $\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}x) = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}'x),\ \forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$, if and only if $\tilde{X} + \tilde{X}' = \begin{pmatrix} (Z_1)_{n\times n} & Z_2 & 0 \\ Z_3 & Z_1^t & 0 \\ \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 & a \end{pmatrix}$, where $Z_2^t = Z_2, Z_3^t = Z_3$. Hence $\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}x) = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}'x),\ \forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$, if and only if $\beta((\tilde{X}+\tilde{X}')v, w)+\beta(v, (\tilde{X}+\tilde{X}')w) = 0,\ \forall\ v \in V$, which is equivalent to $\tilde{X}^tS+S\tilde{X} = \tilde{X}'^tS + S\tilde{X}'$. $\square$

Given $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Denote $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ the vector space V equipped with the quadratic form α and the bilinear form β_ξ.

Definition 3.2. Assume $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. We say $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ and $(V_\zeta, \alpha, \beta_\zeta)$ are equivalent if there exists a vector space isomorphism $g : V_\xi \to V_\zeta$ such that $\alpha(gv) = \alpha(v)$ and $\beta_\zeta(gv, gw) = \beta_\xi(v, w)$ for any $v, w \in V_\xi$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, then ξ, ζ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $\beta_\zeta(gv, gw) = \beta_\xi(v, w)$ for any $v, w \in V$.*

Proof. Assume $\xi(x) = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}_\xi x), \zeta(x) = \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{X}_\zeta x),\ \forall x \in \mathfrak{g}$. By same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, ξ, ζ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $\beta((g\tilde{X}_\xi g^{-1} + \tilde{X}_\zeta)v, w) + \beta(v, (g\tilde{X}_\xi g^{-1} + \tilde{X}_\zeta)w) = 0,\ \forall\ v \in V$, which is equivalent to $X_\xi = g^tX_\zeta g$. $\square$

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, then ξ, ζ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ is equivalent to $(V_\zeta, \alpha, \beta_\zeta)$.*

Assume $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ are nilpotent. We derive in the following some necessary conditions for $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ and $(V_\zeta, \alpha, \beta_\zeta)$ being equivalent.

From now on assume $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is nilpotent. Let X_ξ and $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ be defined as above. Let λ be a formal parameter. Let $v_0, \ldots, v_m$ be a set of vectors which is a solution for the equation $(X_\xi + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^m v_i\lambda^i = 0$ such that m is minimal, namely, such that $v_0 \neq 0$. Lemma 3.5-3.9 in the following extend some results in [5].

Lemma 3.5. *The vectors $v_0, \ldots, v_m$ (up to multiple) and $m \geq 0$ are uniquely determined by X_ξ. Moreover, $\beta(v_i, v_j) = \beta_\xi(v_i, v_j) = 0$, $i, j = 0, \ldots, m$, $\alpha(v_i) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$ and can assume $\alpha(v_m) = 1$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from the rank of S being $2n$. Can assume X_ξ has the form $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1^t & 0 \\ x_1 & x_2 + x_2^t & \gamma \\ 0 & \gamma^t & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ where x_1 and x_2 are strictly upper triangular $n \times n$ matrices. Then m is the smallest integer such that $x_1^m\gamma = 0$. Take $v_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{m-1}\gamma \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$,$v_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{m-2}\gamma \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, …, $v_{m-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $v_m = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *There exist $u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{m-1}$ such that $\beta(v_i, u_j) = \beta_\xi(v_{i+1}, u_j) = \delta_{i,j}$, $\beta(u_i, u_j) = \beta_\xi(u_i, u_j) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m$, $j = 0, \ldots, m-1$ and $\alpha(u_i) = 0, i = 0, \ldots, m-1$.*

Proof. Write $u_i = \begin{pmatrix} (u_i^1)_{n\times 1} \\ (u_i^2)_{n\times 1} \\ u_i^3 \end{pmatrix}$. Let u_0 satisfy $u_0^{2t}x_1^i\gamma = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-2$, $u_0^{2t}x_1^{m-1}\gamma = 1$ and $u_0^3 = \sqrt{u_0^{2t}u_0^1}$ (such u_0 exists). Define u_i, $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$

inductively by $u_i^2 = x_1^t u_{i-1}^2$, $u_i^1 = x_1 u_{i-1} + (x_2 + x_2^t) u_{i-1}^2 + u_{i-1}^3 \gamma$, and $u_i^3 = \sqrt{u_i^{2t} u_i^1}$. Then we have $X_\xi u_{i-1} = S u_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$. Thus $\beta(u_i, u_{i+2k}) = u_{i+k}^t S u_{i+k} = \beta(u_{i+k}, u_{i+k}) = 0$, $\beta(u_i, u_{i+2k+1}) = u_{i+k}^t S u_{i+k+1} = u_{i+k}^t X_\xi u_{i+k} = 0$. It follows that $\beta(u_i, u_j) = 0$. Similarly $\beta_\xi(u_i, u_j) = 0$. The u_i's satisfy the conditions desired. □

Lemma 3.7. *The vectors* $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_m, u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{m-1}$ *are linearly independent.*

Proof. Assume $\sum_{i=0}^m a_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i u_i = 0$. Then $\beta(\sum_{i=0}^m a_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i u_i, u_j) = a_j = 0$, $\beta(\sum_{i=0}^m a_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i u_i, v_j) = b_j = 0$, $j = 0, \ldots, m-1$ and $\beta_\xi(\sum_{i=0}^m a_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i u_i, u_{m-1}) = a_m = 0$. □

Let V_{2m+1} be the vector subspace spanned by $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_m, u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{m-1}$, and $W = \{w \in V_\xi | \beta(w, v) = \beta_\xi(w, v) = 0, \ \forall\ v \in V_{2m+1}\}$.

Lemma 3.8. *We have* $V_\xi = V_{2m+1} \perp_{\beta, \beta_\xi} W$.

Proof. A vector w is in W if and only if $\beta(w, v_i) = \beta_\xi(w, v_i) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m$ and $\beta(w, u_i) = \beta_\xi(w, u_i) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$. By our choice of v_i and u_i's, we have $S v_m = X_\xi v_0 = 0$, $\beta(w, v_i) = \beta_\xi(w, v_{i+1})$ and $\beta(w, u_i) = \beta_\xi(w, u_{i-1})$. Hence $w \in W$ if and only if $\beta(w, u_i) = \beta(w, v_i) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$ and $\beta_\xi(w, u_{m-1}) = 0$. Thus $\dim W \geq \dim V_\xi - (2m+1)$. Now we show $V_{2m+1} \cap W = \{0\}$. Let $w = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i u_i \in V_{2m+1} \cap W$. We have $\beta(w, u_j) = a_j = 0$, $\beta(w, v_j) = b_j = 0$, $j = 0, \ldots, m-1$, and $\beta_\xi(w, u_{m-1}) = a_m = 0$. Hence together with the dimension condition we get the conclusion. □

Lemma 3.9. *Assume* $V_\xi = V_{2m_\xi+1,\xi} \oplus W_\xi$ *is equivalent to* $V_\zeta = V_{2m_\zeta+1,\zeta} \oplus W_\zeta$, *then* $m_\xi = m_\zeta$ *and* $(W_\xi, \beta, \beta_\xi)$ *is equivalent to* $(W_\zeta, \beta, \beta_\zeta)$.

Proof. Assume $V_{2m_\xi+1,\xi} = \text{span}\{v_i^1, u_i^1\}$, $V_{2m_\zeta+1,\zeta} = \text{span}\{v_i^2, u_i^2\}$, where $(X_\xi + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^{m_\xi} v_i^1 \lambda^i = 0$ and $(X_\zeta + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^{m_\zeta} v_i^2 \lambda^i = 0$. By assumption, there exists $g : V_{2m_\xi+1,\xi} \oplus W_\xi \to V_{2m_\zeta+1,\zeta} \oplus W_\zeta$ such that $\beta(gv, gw) = \beta(v, w)$ and $\beta_\zeta(gv, gw) = \beta_\xi(v, w)$. We have $(X_\zeta + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^{m_\zeta} v_i^2 \lambda^i = 0$. This implies that $(X_\xi + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^{m_\zeta} g^{-1} v_i^2 \lambda^i = 0$. Hence $m_\xi = m_\zeta$ and $g^{-1} v_i^2 \in V_{2m_\xi+1,\xi}$.

For $w \in W_\xi$, suppose $gw = \sum a_i v_i^2 + \sum b_i u_i^2 + w'$ where $w' \in W_\zeta$. Since $g^{-1} v_i^2 \in V_{2m_\xi+1,\xi}$, we have $\beta_\xi(g^{-1} v_i^2, w) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m_\xi$. It follows that $\beta_\zeta(v_i^2, gw) = b_i = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m_\xi - 1$. We get $gw = \sum a_i v_i^2 + w'$. Define $\varphi : W_\xi \to W_\zeta$ by $w \mapsto gw$ projects to W_ζ. Let $w_1, w_2 \in W_\xi$. Assume $gw_1 = \sum a_i^1 v_i^2 + w_1'$, $gw_2 = \sum a_i^2 v_i^2 + w_2'$. We have $\beta(gw_1, gw_2) = \beta(w_1', w_2') = \beta(w_1, w_2), \beta_\zeta(gw_1, gw_2) = \beta_\zeta(w_1', w_2') = \beta_\xi(w_1, w_2)$, namely, $\beta(\varphi(w_1), \varphi(w_2)) = \beta(w_1, w_2)$, $\beta_\zeta(\varphi(w_1), \varphi(w_2)) = \beta_\xi(w_1, w_2)$. Now we show that φ is a bijection. Let $w \in W_\xi$ be such that $\varphi(w) = 0$. Then for any $v \in W_\xi$, $\beta(v, w) = \beta(\varphi(v), \varphi(w)) = 0$. Since $\beta|_{W_\xi \times W_\xi}$ is nondegenerate, $w = 0$. Thus φ is injective. On the other hand, we have $\dim W_\xi = \dim W_\zeta$. Hence φ is bijective. □

Let $V_\xi = V_{2m+1} \oplus W$ be as in Lemma 3.8. Then we get a $2(n-m)$ dimensional vector space W, equipped with a quadratic form $\alpha|_W$ and a bilinear form $\beta_\xi|_{W \times W}$. It is easily seen the quadratic form $\alpha|_W$ is non-defective on W, namely, $\beta|_{W \times W}$ is non-degenerate. We have maps $\phi_\beta : W \to W^*$, $w \mapsto (w' \mapsto \beta(w, w'))$ and $\phi_{\beta_\xi} : W \to W^*$, $w \mapsto (w' \mapsto \beta_\xi(w, w'))$. Since $\beta|_{W \times W}$ is non-degenerate, ϕ_β is invertible. Define $T_\xi : W \to W$ to be the linear map $\phi_\beta^{-1} \cdot \phi_{\beta_\xi}$.

Corollary 3.10. *Assume $V_\xi = V_{2m_\xi+1,\xi} \oplus W_\xi$ is equivalent to $V_\zeta = V_{2m_\zeta+1,\zeta} \oplus W_\zeta$, then $m_\xi = m_\zeta$ and T_ξ, T_ζ are conjugate.*

Lemma 3.11. *Assume ξ is nilpotent. Then T_ξ is nilpotent.*

Proof. Let $T = SX_\xi = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 + x_2^t & \gamma \\ 0 & x_1^t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ (X_ξ as in the proof of Lemma 3.5), then T is nilpotent. Let $w \in W$. We have $\beta(v_m, Tw) = 0$ and $\beta(v_i, Tw) = v_i^t SSX_\xi w = \beta_\xi(v_i, w) = 0$, since $v_i^t SS = v_i$, $i = 0, \dots m-1$. We show that $\beta(u_i, Tw) = u_i^t SSX_\xi w = 0, i = 0, \dots m-1$. For $w = ((w^1)_{1\times n}, (w^2)_{1\times n}, w^3)^t \in W$, we have $\beta_\xi(v_m, w) = \gamma^t w^{2t} = 0$. Thus $u_i^t X_\xi w = u_i^{2t} x_1 w^{1t} + (u_i^{1t} x_1^t + u_i^{2t}(x_2 + x_2^t) + u_i^{3t}\gamma^t) w^{2t} + u_i^{2t}\gamma w^3 = u_i^{2t} x_1 w^{1t} + (u_i^{1t} x_1^t + u_i^{2t}(x_2 + x_2^t)) w^{2t} + u_i^{2t}\gamma w^3 = u_i^t SSX_\xi w$ and $\beta(u_i, Tw) = 0$ follows.

Suppose $Tw = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i u_i + w_0$, where $w_0 \in W$. Then $\beta(v_i, Tw) = b_i = 0, \beta(u_i, Tw) = a_i = 0, i = 0, \dots, m-1$, $a_m = \beta_\xi(u_{m-1}, Tw)$. Thus we have $Tw = \beta_\xi(u_{m-1}, Tw) v_m + w_0$. We claim that $T_\xi w = w_0$. In fact we have $\beta_\xi(w, w') = \beta(Tw, w') = \beta(w_0, w')$ for any $w' \in W$. Thus $\phi_{\beta_\xi}(w) = \phi_\beta(w_0)$. Write $c_i = \beta_\xi(u_{m-1}, T^i w)$. We have $T_\xi w = Tw + c_1 v_m$ and $T^i v_m = v_{m-i}$. It is shown by induction that $T_\xi^j w = T^j w + \sum_{i=1}^j c_j v_{m-j+i}, j \leq m+1$ and $T_\xi^{m+j} w = T^{m+j} w + \sum_{i=0}^m c_{j+i} v_j$. Since T is nilpotent, for i big enough, we have $c_i = 0$ and $T^i = 0$. Thus T_ξ is nilpotent. ☐

3.2. In this subsection assume **k** is algebraically closed. From above, every form module $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ can be reduced to the form $V_\xi = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_\xi$, where V_{2m+1} has standard basis as in Lemma 3.5 and 3.6. We have that $(V_\xi, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$ is determined by V_{2m+1} and $(W_\xi, \alpha|_{W_\xi}, \beta_\xi|_{W_\xi \times W_\xi})$. Now we consider $(W_\xi, \alpha|_{W_\xi}, \beta_\xi|_{W_\xi \times W_\xi}) := (W, \alpha|_W, \beta_\xi|_{W\times W})$ and let $T_\xi : W \to W$ be defined as in subsection 3.1. Let $\mathfrak{o}(W) = \{x \in \mathfrak{gl}(W) | \beta(xw, w) = 0, \ \forall\ w \in W\}$.

Lemma 3.12. *On W, we have $\beta_\xi(w, w') = \beta(T_\xi w, w')$ for any $w, w' \in W$ and $T_\xi \in \mathfrak{o}(W)$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows from the definition of T_ξ. The second assertion follows since $\beta(T_\xi w, w) = \beta_\xi(w, w)$ and β_ξ is an alternating bilinear form. ☐

It follows that $\beta_\xi|_{W\times W}$ is determined by T_ξ and $\beta|_{W\times W}$. Since $T_\xi \in \mathfrak{o}(W)$ is nilpotent (Lemma 3.11), we can view W as a $k[T_\xi]-$module. By the classification of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{o}(W)$, W is equivalent to $W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}(m_s)$ for some $m_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_s$, $l_1 \geq \cdots \geq l_s$ and $m_1 - l_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_s - l_s$, where $[(m_i+1)/2] \leq l_i \leq m_i$ (notation as in [2]).

Lemma 3.13. *Assume $m < k - l$. We have $V_{2m+1} \oplus W_l(k) \cong V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{k-m}(k)$.*

Proof. Assume $V_{2m+1} = \text{span}\{v_0, \dots, v_m, u_0, \dots, u_{m-1}\}$, where v_i, u_i are chosen as in Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. Assume $V_{2m+1} \oplus W_l(k)$ and $V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{k-m}(k)$ correspond to ξ_1 and ξ_2 respectively. Let $T_1 = T_{\xi_1} : W_{l_1}(k) \to W_{l_1}(k)$ and $T_2 = T_{\xi_2} : W_{l_2}(k) \to W_{l_2}(k)$ be defined as before. There exist ρ_1, ρ_2 such that $W_l(k) = \text{span}\{\rho_1, \dots, T_1^{k-1}\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, T_1^{k-1}\rho_2\}$, $T_1^k \rho_1 = T_1^k \rho_2 = 0$, $\alpha(T_1^i \rho_1) = \delta_{i,l-1}$, $\alpha(T_1^i \rho_2) = 0$, $\beta(T_1^i \rho_1, T_1^j \rho_1) = \beta(T_1^i \rho_2, T_1^j \rho_2) = 0$ and $\beta(T_1^i \rho_1, T_1^j \rho_2) = \delta_{i+j,k-1}$. There exist τ_1, τ_2 such that $W_{k-m}(k) = \text{span}\{\tau_1, \dots, T_2^{k-1}\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, T_2^{k-1}\tau_2\}$, $T_2^k \tau_1 = T_2^k \tau_2 = 0$, $\alpha(T_2^i \tau_1) = \delta_{i,k-m-1}$, $\alpha(T_2^i \tau_2) = 0$, $\beta(T_2^i \tau_1, T_2^j \tau_1) = \beta(T_2^i \tau_2, T_2^j \tau_2) =$

0 and $\beta(T_2^i\tau_1, T_2^j\tau_2) = \delta_{i+j,k-1}$. Define $g : V_{2m+1} \oplus W_l(k) \to V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{k-m}(k)$ by $gv_i = v_i,\ gu_i = u_i + (T_2^{k-(m+l)+i} + T_2^i)\tau_2, gT_1^j\rho_2 = T_2^j\tau_2,\ gT_1^j\rho_1 = T_2^j\tau_1 + v_{k-1-j} + v_{m+l-1-j}$ where $v_i = 0$, if $i < 0$ or $i > m$. Then g is the isomorphism as desired. □

Lemma 3.14. *Assume $m \geq k - l_i, i = 1, 2$. We have $V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}(k) \cong V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_2}(k)$ if and only if $l_1 = l_2$.*

Proof. Assume $k - m \leq l_1 < l_2$. We show that $V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}(k) \ncong V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_2}(k)$. Let $(V_1, \alpha, \beta_1) = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}(k)$ and $(V_2, \alpha, \beta_2) = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_2}(k)$. Let $T_1 : W_{l_1}(k) \to W_{l_1}(k)$ and $T_2 : W_{l_2}(k) \to W_{l_2}(k)$ be defined as before. Assume there exists $g : V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}(k) \to V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_2}(k)$ a linear isomorphism satisfying $\beta_2(gv, gw) = \beta_1(v, w)$ and $\alpha(gv) = \alpha(v)$. Define $\varphi : W_{l_1}(k) \to W_{l_2}(k)$ by $w_1 \mapsto$ (gw_1 projects to $W_{l_2}(k)$). Then we have $\beta(\varphi(w_1), \varphi(w_1')) = \beta(w_1, w_1')$, $\beta_2(\varphi(w_1), \varphi(w_1')) = \beta_1(w_1, w_1')$ and $T_2(\varphi(w)) = \varphi(T_1(w))$(see proof of Lemma 3.9).

Let v_i, $i = 0, \ldots, m$, and u_i, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$, be the basis of V_{2m+1} as in Lemma 3.5 and 3.6. Choose a basis $T_i^j\rho_i, T_i^j\tau_i$, $j = 0, \ldots, k-1$, $i = 1, 2$ of $W_{l_i}(k)$ such that $T_i^k\rho_i = T_i^k\tau_i = 0$, $\beta(T_i^{j_1}\rho_i, T_j^{j_2}\tau_j) = \delta_{j_1+j_2,k-1}\delta_{i,j}$, $\beta(T_i^{j_1}\rho_i, T_j^{j_2}\rho_j) = \beta(T_i^{j_1}\tau_i, T_j^{j_2}\tau_j) = 0$, $\alpha(T_i^j\rho_i) = \delta_{j,l_i-1}$ and $\alpha(T_i^j\tau_i) = 0$. We have

$$gv_i = av_i, i = 0, \ldots, m,\ gu_i = u_i/a + \sum_{l=0}^{m} a_{il}v_l + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} x_{il}T_2^l\rho_2 + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} y_{il}T_2^l\tau_2.$$

Now we can assume

$$gT_1^j\rho_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} a_iT_2^{i+j}\rho_2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} b_iT_2^{i+j}\tau_2 + \sum_{i=0}^{m} c_{ij}v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_{ij}u_i,\ j = 0, \ldots, k-1,$$

$$gT_1^j\tau_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} e_iT_2^{i+j}\rho_2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} f_iT_2^{i+j}\tau_2 + \sum_{i=0}^{m} g_{ij}v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} h_{ij}u_i,\ j = 0, \ldots, k-1.$$

We have

$$\beta(gv_i, gT_1^j\rho_1) = \beta(v_i, T_1^j\rho_1) = 0 \Rightarrow d_{ij} = 0,\ i = 0, \ldots, m-1,\ j = 0, \ldots, k-1,$$
$$\beta(gv_i, gT_1^j\tau_1) = \beta(v_i, T_1^j\tau_1) = 0 \Rightarrow h_{ij} = 0,\ i = 0, \ldots, m-1,\ j = 0, \ldots, k-1,$$

$$\beta(gu_i, gT_1^j\rho_1) = \beta(u_i, T_1^j\rho_1) = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{c_{ij}}{a} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1-j} (x_{il}b_{k-1-j-l} + y_{il}a_{k-1-j-l}) = 0,$$

$$\beta_\xi(gu_i, gT_1^j\rho_1) = \beta_\xi(u_i, T_1^j\rho_1) = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{c_{i+1,j}}{a} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2-j} (x_{il}b_{k-2-j-l} + y_{il}a_{k-2-j-l}) = 0.$$

The last two equations imply that

$$c_{m,k-1} = 0, c_{ij} = c_{i+1,j-1}, i = 0, \ldots, m-1, j = 0, \ldots, k-1. \tag{1}$$

Similarly we have

$$g_{m,k-1} = 0, g_{ij} = g_{i+1,j-1}, i = 0, \ldots, m-1, j = 0, \ldots, k-1. \tag{2}$$

We also have

$$\alpha(gT_1^{l_1-1}\rho_1) = \alpha(T_1^{l_1-1}\rho_1) = 1 \Rightarrow c^2_{m,l_1-1} + a^2_{l_2-l_1} + \sum_{i=0}^{k+1-2l_1} a_ib_{k+1-2l_1-i} = 1,$$

$$\alpha(gT_1^{l_2-1}\rho_1)=\alpha(T_1^{l_2-1}\rho_1)=0\Rightarrow c_{m,l_2-1}^2+a_0^2+\sum_{i=0}^{k+1-2l_2}a_ib_{k+1-2l_2-i}=0,$$

$$\alpha(gT_1^{l_2-1}\tau_1)=\alpha(T_1^{l_2-1}\tau_1)=0\Rightarrow g_{m,l_2-1}^2+e_0^2+\sum_{i=0}^{k+1-2l_2}a_ib_{k+1-2l_2-i}=0.$$

Since $l_2>l_1\geq[k+1]/2$, we have $k+1-2l_2<0$. Thus we get $a_0=c_{m,l_2-1}$ and $e_0=g_{m,l_2-1}$. Since $l_2>k-m$, by Equations (1) and (2) we get $c_{m,l_2-1}=g_{m,l_2-1}=0$ (if $l_2=k$) or $c_{m,l_2-1}=c_{0,l_2+m-1}=0$, $g_{m,l_2-1}=g_{0,l_2+m-1}=0$ (if $l_2<k$). Thus $a_0=e_0=0$. But from $\beta(g\rho_1,gT_1^{k-1}\tau_1)=\beta(\rho_1,T_1^{k-1}\tau_1)=1$ we have $a_0f_0+e_0b_0=1$. This is a contradiction. □

It follows that for any $V=(V_\xi,\alpha,\beta_\xi)$, there exist a unique $m\geq 0$ and a unique sequence of modules $W_{l_i}(k_i)$, $i=1,\dots,s$ such that $V\cong V_{2m+1}\oplus W_{l_1}(k_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_s}(k_s)$, $[(k_i+1)/2]\leq l_i\leq k_i$, $k_1\geq k_2\geq\cdots\geq k_s$, $l_1\geq l_2\geq\cdots\geq l_s$ and $m\geq k_1-l_1\geq k_2-l_2\geq\cdots\geq k_s-l_s$. Hence the nilpotent orbits can be classified by pairs of partitions $(m,k_1-l_1,\dots,k_s-l_s)(l_1,\dots,l_s)$ where $l_1\geq l_2\geq\cdots\geq l_s\geq 0$ and $m\geq k_1-l_1\geq k_2-l_2\geq\cdots\geq k_s-l_s\geq 0$. The set of nilpotent orbits is in bijection with the set $\{(\nu,\mu)|\nu=(\nu_0,\nu_1,\dots,\nu_s),\mu=(\mu_1,\mu_2,\dots,\mu_s),|\mu|+|\nu|=n,\nu_i\leq\mu_i,i=1,\dots,s\}$, which has cardinality $p_2(n)-p_2(n-2)$.

3.3. In this subsection, we classify the form modules (V_ξ,α,β_ξ) over $\mathbf{F}_q$. We still have $V_\xi=V_{2m+1}\oplus W_\xi$ for some m and W_ξ(Lemma 3.5-3.8 are valid over $\mathbf{F}_q$). By the classification of $(W_\xi,\alpha|_{W_\xi},T_\xi)$ over $\mathbf{F}_q$, we have $W_\xi\cong\oplus W_{l_i}^{\epsilon_i}(k_i)$ where $\epsilon_i=0$ or δ, $m_1\geq\cdots\geq m_s$, $l_1\geq\cdots\geq l_s$, $m_1-l_1\geq\cdots\geq m_s-l_s$ and $[(m_i+1)/2]\leq l_i\leq m_i$ (notation as in [7]).

Lemma 3.15. *Assume $m\geq k-l$. If $l>m$, then $V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^0(k)\cong V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^\delta(k)$.*

Proof. Let $W_l^0(k)=(W_1,\alpha,T_1)$ and $W_l^\delta(k)=(W_2,\alpha,T_2)$. Take ρ_1,ρ_2 such that $W_l^0(k)=\text{span}\{\rho_1,\dots,T_1^{k-1}\rho_1,\rho_2,\dots,T_1^{k-1}\rho_2\}$, $\alpha(T_1^i\rho_1)=\delta_{i,l-1}$, $\alpha(T_1^i\rho_2)=0$, $\beta(T_1^i\rho_1,T_1^j\rho_1)=\beta(T_1^i\rho_2,T_1^j\rho_2)=0$ and $\beta(T_1^i\rho_1,T_1^j\rho_2)=\delta_{i+j,k-1}$. Take τ_1,τ_2 such that $W_l^\delta(k)=\text{span}\{\tau_1,\dots,T_2^{k-1}\tau_1,\tau_2,\dots,T_2^{k-1}\tau_2\}$, $T_2^k\tau_1=T_2^k\tau_2=0$, $\alpha(T_2^i\tau_1)=\delta_{i,l-1}$, $\alpha(T_2^i\tau_2)=\delta_{i,k-l}\delta$, $\beta(T_2^i\tau_1,T_2^j\tau_1)=\beta(T_2^i\tau_2,T_2^j\tau_2)=0$ and $\beta(T_2^i\tau_1,T_2^j\tau_2)=\delta_{i+j,k-1}$. Let v_i,u_i be the basis of V_{2m+1} as in Lemma 3.5 and 3.6. Define $g:V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^0(k)\to V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^\delta(k)$ by $gv_i=v_i$, $gu_i=u_i+\sqrt{\delta}T_2^{l-m-1+i}\tau_1$,
$gT_1^i\rho_1=T_2^i\tau_1$, $gT_1^i\rho_2=T_2^i\tau_2+\sqrt{\delta}v_{k-l+m-i}$, where $v_i=0$ if $i<0$ or $i>m$. □

Lemma 3.16. *Assume $m\geq k-l$. If $l\leq m$, then $V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^0(k)\ncong V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^\delta(k)$.*

Proof. Let v_i, $i=0,\dots,m$ and u_i, $i=0,\dots,m-1$ be the basis of V_{2m+1} as in Lemma 3.5 and 3.6. Let $W_l^0(k)=(W_0,\alpha,T_0)$ and $W_l^\delta(k)=(W_\delta,\alpha,T_\delta)$. Choose a basis $T_\epsilon^j\rho_\epsilon,T_\epsilon^j\tau_\epsilon$, $j=0,\dots,k-1$, $\epsilon=0,\delta$ of $W_l^\epsilon(k)$ such that $T_\epsilon^k\rho_\epsilon=T_\epsilon^k\tau_\epsilon=0$, $\beta(T_{\epsilon_1}^{j_1}\rho_{\epsilon_1},T_{\epsilon_2}^{j_2}\tau_{\epsilon_2})=\delta_{j_1+j_2,k-1}\delta_{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2}$, $\beta(T_{\epsilon_1}^{j_1}\rho_{\epsilon_1},T_{\epsilon_2}^{j_2}\rho_{\epsilon_2})=\beta(T_{\epsilon_1}^{j_1}\tau_{\epsilon_1},T_{\epsilon_2}^{j_2}\tau_{\epsilon_2})=0$, $\alpha(T_\epsilon^j\rho_\epsilon)=\delta_{j,l-1}$ and $\alpha(T_\epsilon^j\tau_\epsilon)=\epsilon\delta_{j,k-l}\delta_{\epsilon,\delta}$. Assume there exists $g:V_{2m+1}\oplus W_l^0(k)\to V_{2m+1}\oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(k)$ a linear isomorphism satisfying $\beta(gv,gw)=\beta(v,w)$, $\beta_\delta(gv,gw)=\beta_0(v,w)$ and $\alpha(gv)=\alpha(v)$. We have

$$gv_i=av_i,i=0,\dots,m,\ gu_i=u_i/a+\sum_{l=0}^{m}a_{il}v_l+\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}x_{il}T_\delta^l\rho_\delta+\sum_{l=0}^{k-1}y_{il}T_\delta^l\tau_\delta.$$

Now we can assume

$$gT_0^j\rho_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} a_iT_\delta^{i+j}\rho_\delta + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} b_iT_\delta^{i+j}\tau_\delta + \sum_{i=0}^{m} c_{ij}v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_{ij}u_i,\ j=0,\ldots,k-1,$$

$$gT_0^j\tau_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} e_iT_\delta^{i+j}\rho_\delta + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1-j} f_iT_\delta^{i+j}\tau_\delta + \sum_{i=0}^{m} g_{ij}v_i + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} h_{ij}u_i,\ j=0,\ldots,k-1.$$

By similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.14, we get that $c_{m,k-1}=0, g_{m,k-1}=0, c_{ij}=c_{i+1,j-1}, g_{ij}=g_{i+1,j-1}, i=0,\ldots,m-1, j=0,\ldots,k-1$. Since we have $m\geq l$, $c_{m,i}=c_{0,i+m}=0$ and $g_{m,i}=g_{0,i+m}=0$ when $i\geq k-l$. We get some of the equations are $a_0^2+a_0b_0+\delta b_0^2=1, e_0^2+e_0f_0+\delta f_0^2=0$ and $a_0f_0+b_0e_0=1$ (when $l=(k+1)/2$) or $a_{l-1-i}^2+\sum_{j=0}^{k-1-2i}a_jb_{k-1-2i-j}+\delta b_{k-l-i}^2=\delta_{i,l-1}$, $e_{l-1-i}^2+\sum_{j=0}^{k-1-2i}e_jf_{k-1-2i-j}+\delta f_{k-l-i}^2=0,\ k-l\leq i\leq l-1$ and $a_0f_0+b_0e_0=1$ (when $l>(k+1)/2$). We get $a_0=f_0=1, e_i=0, i=0,\ldots,2l-k-2$ and $e_{2l-k-1}^2+e_{2l-k-1}+\delta=0$. This is a contradiction. ☐

Recall we have the following lemma ([7]).

Lemma 3.17. *Assume* $k_1\geq k_2$, $l_1\geq l_2$ *and* $k_1-l_1\geq k_2-l_2$. *If* $l_1+l_2>k_1$, *then* $W_{l_1}^0(k_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^0(k_2)\cong W_{l_1}^\delta(k_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(k_2)$ *and* $W_{l_1}^0(k_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^\delta(k_2)\cong W_{l_1}^\delta(k_1)\oplus W_{l_2}^0(k_2)$.

Let $G(\mathbf{F}_q)$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)$ be the fixed points of a Frobenius map $\mathfrak{F}_q$ relative to $\mathbf{F}_q$ on G, $\mathfrak{g}$.

Proposition 3.18. *The nilpotent orbit in* $\mathfrak{g}^*$ *corresponding to the pair of partitions* $(\nu_0,\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_s)(\mu_1,\mu_2,\ldots,\mu_s)$ *splits into at most* 2^k $G(\boldsymbol{F}_q)$*-orbits in* $\mathfrak{g}(\boldsymbol{F}_q)^*$, *where* $k=\#\{i\geq 1|\nu_i<\mu_i\leq\nu_{i-1}\}$.

Proof. Let $V=V_{2m+1}\oplus W_{l_1}(\lambda_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_s}(\lambda_s)$ be a form module corresponding to (ν,μ) over $\overline{\mathbf{F}}_q$. We show that the equivalence class of V over $\overline{\mathbf{F}}_q$ decomposes into at most 2^k equivalence classes over $\mathbf{F}_q$. It is enough to show that form modules of the form $V_{2m+1}\oplus W_{l_1}^{\epsilon_1}(\lambda_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_s}^{\epsilon_s}(\lambda_s)$, $\epsilon_i=0$ or δ, have at most 2^k equivalence classes over $\mathbf{F}_q$. Suppose $i_1,\ldots,i_k$ are such that $\beta_{i_j}<\mu_{i_j}\leq\beta_{i_j-1}$, $j=1,\ldots,k$. Using Lemma 3.15, 3.16 and 3.17, one can easily verify that form modules of the above form is isomorphic to one of the following modules: $V_1^{\epsilon_1}\oplus\cdots\oplus V_k^{\epsilon_k}\oplus V_{k+1}$, where $V_1^{\epsilon_1}=V_{2m+1}\oplus W_{l_1}^0(\lambda_1)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_{i_1-1}}^0(\lambda_{i_1-1})\oplus W_{l_{i_1}}^{\epsilon_1}(\lambda_{i_1})$, $V_t^{\epsilon_t}=W_{l_{i_{t-1}+1}}^0(\lambda_{i_{t-1}+1})\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_{i_t-1}}^0(\lambda_{i_t-1})\oplus W_{l_{i_t}}^{\epsilon_t}(\lambda_{i_t})$, $t=2,\ldots,k$, $\epsilon_i=0$ or δ, $i=1,\ldots,k$, and $V_{k+1}=W_{l_{i_k+1}}^0(\lambda_{i_k+1})\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{l_s}^0(\lambda_s)$. Thus the proposition follows. ☐

Proposition 3.19. *The number of nilpotent* $G(\boldsymbol{F}_q)$*-orbits in* $\mathfrak{g}(\boldsymbol{F}_q)^*$ *is at most* $p_2(n)$.

Proof. We have mapped the nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\overline{\mathbf{F}}_q)^*$ bijectively to the set $\{(\nu,\mu)|\nu=(\nu_0,\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_s),\mu=(\mu_1,\mu_2,\ldots,\mu_s),|\mu|+|\nu|=n,\nu_i\leq\mu_i,i=1,\ldots,s\}:=\Delta$. Let $(\nu,\mu)\in\Delta$, $\nu=(\nu_0,\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_s),\mu=(\mu_1,\mu_2,\cdots,\mu_s)$. By Proposition 3.18, the nilpotent orbit corresponding to (ν,μ) splits into at most 2^k orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$, where $k=\#\{i\geq 1|\nu_i<\mu_i\leq\nu_{i-1}\}$. We associate 2^k pairs of partitions to this orbit as follows. Suppose $r_1,r_2,...,r_k$ are such that $\nu_{r_i}<\mu_{r_i}\leq\nu_{r_i-1},i=1,...,k$. Let $\nu^0=(\nu_0,\ldots,\nu_{r_1-1}),\mu^0=(\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_{r_1-1}),\nu^{1,i}=(\nu_{r_i},\ldots,\nu_{r_{i+1}-1}),\mu^{1,i}=(\mu_{r_i},\ldots,\mu_{r_{i+1}-1}),\nu^{2,i}=(\mu_{r_i},\ldots,\mu_{r_{i+1}-1}),\mu^{2,i}=(\nu_{r_i},\ldots,\nu_{r_{i+1}-1}),i=1,\ldots,k-$

$1, \nu^{1,k} = (\nu_{r_k}, \dots, \nu_s), \mu^{1,k} = (\mu_{r_k}, \dots, \mu_s), \nu^{2,k} = (\mu_{r_k}, \dots, \mu_s), \mu^{2,k} = (\nu_{r_k}, \dots, \nu_s)$. Then we associate to (ν, μ) the pairs of partitions $(\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k}, \tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k})$, $\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k} = (\nu^0, \nu^{\epsilon_1,1}, \nu^{\epsilon_2,2}, \dots, \nu^{\epsilon_k,k}), \tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k} = (\mu^0, \mu^{\epsilon_1,1}, \mu^{\epsilon_2,2}, \dots, \mu^{\epsilon_k,k})$, where $\epsilon_i \in \{1,2\}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Notice that the pairs of partitions $(\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k}, \tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k})$ are distinct and among them only $(\nu, \mu) = (\tilde{\nu}^{1,\dots,1}, \tilde{\mu}^{1,\dots,1})$ is in Δ. One can verify that $\{(\tilde{\nu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k}, \tilde{\mu}^{\epsilon_1,\dots,\epsilon_k}) | (\nu, \mu) \in \Delta\} = \{(\nu, \mu) | |\nu| + |\mu| = n\}$. ☐

4. EVEN ORTHOGONAL GROUP

Let V be a vector space of dimension $2n$ over $\mathbf{k}$ equipped with a non-defective quadratic form $\alpha : V \to \mathbf{k}$. Let $\beta : V \times V \to \mathbf{k}$ be the non-degenerate bilinear form associated to α. The even orthogonal group is defined as $G = O(2n) = \{g \in GL(V) \mid \alpha(gv) = \alpha(v), \forall\ v \in V\}$ and its Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{o}(2n) = \{x \in \mathfrak{gl}(V) \mid \beta(xv, v) = 0, \forall\ v \in V\}$. Let $G(\mathbf{F}_q)$, $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)$ be the fixed points of a split Frobenius map $\mathfrak{F}_q$ relative to $\mathbf{F}_q$ on G, $\mathfrak{g}$.

Proposition 4.1. *The numbers of nilpotent $G(\boldsymbol{F}_q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\boldsymbol{F}_q)$ and in $\mathfrak{g}(\boldsymbol{F}_q)^*$ are the same.*

The proposition can be proved in two ways.

First proof. We show that there is a G-invariant non-degenerate bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{o}(2n)$(G. Lusztig). Then we can identify $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^*$ via this bilinear form and thus proposition follows. Consider the vector space $\bigwedge^2 V$ on which G acts in a natural way: $g(a \wedge b) = ga \wedge gb$. On $\bigwedge^2 V$ there is a G-invariant non-degenerate bilinear form

$$\langle a \wedge b, c \wedge d \rangle = \det \begin{bmatrix} \beta(a,c) & \beta(a,d) \\ \beta(b,c) & \beta(b,d) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Define a map $\phi : \bigwedge^2 V \to \mathfrak{o}(V),\ a \wedge b \mapsto \phi_{a\wedge b}$ by $\phi_{a\wedge b}(v) = \beta(a,v)b + \beta(b,v)a$ and extending by linearity. This map is G-equivariant since we have $\phi_{ga\wedge gb} = g\phi_{a\wedge b}g^{-1}$. One can easily verify that ϕ is a bijection. Define $\langle \phi_{a\wedge b}, \phi_{c\wedge d} \rangle_{\mathfrak{o}(V)} = \langle a\wedge b, c\wedge d \rangle$ and extend it to $\mathfrak{o}(V)$ by linearity. This defines a G-invariant non-degenerate bilinear form on $\mathfrak{o}(V)$.

Second proof. With respect to a suitable basis, we can assume $\alpha(v) = v^tBv$ where $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{n\times n} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Thus $\beta(v,w) = v^tSw$ where $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{n\times n} \\ I_{n\times n} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Let ξ be an element of $\mathfrak{g}^*$. There exists $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ such that $\xi(x) = \mathrm{tr}(Xx)$ for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. We define $T_\xi = X + SX^tS$.

Lemma 4.2. *T_ξ is well-defined.*

Proof. It is enough to show the definition does not depend on the choice of X. We have $\mathrm{tr}(Xx) = \mathrm{tr}(X'x),\ \forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$, if and only if $X + X' = \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 & Z_2 \\ Z_3 & Z_1^t \end{pmatrix}$ where $Z_2^t = Z_2, Z_3^t = Z_3$. This is true if and only if $\beta((X+X')v, w) + \beta(v, (X+X')w) = 0,\ \forall\ v \in V$, which is equivalent to $X + SX^tS = X' + SX'^tS$. ☐

Lemma 4.3. *Two elements $\xi, \zeta \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $gT_\xi g^{-1} = T_\zeta$.*

Proof. Assume $\xi(x) = \mathrm{tr}(X_\xi x), \zeta(x) = \mathrm{tr}(X_\zeta x), \forall x \in \mathfrak{g}$. Then ξ, ζ lie in the same G-orbit if and only if there exists $g \in G$ such that $\mathrm{tr}(gX_\xi g^{-1}x) = \mathrm{tr}(X_\zeta x),\ \forall\ x \in \mathfrak{g}$. This is equivalent to $\beta((gX_\xi g^{-1} + X_\zeta)v, w) + \beta(v, (gX_\xi g^{-1} + X_\zeta)w) = 0,\ \forall\ v \in V$, which is true if and only if $gT_\xi g^{-1} = T_\zeta$. ☐

Note that $\beta(T_\xi v, v) = 0$ for any $v \in V$. Thus $T_\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. We have in fact defined a bijection $\theta : \mathfrak{g}^* \to \mathfrak{g}$, $\xi \mapsto T_\xi$. Furthermore, $\theta|_{\mathcal{N}'} : \mathcal{N}' \to \mathcal{N}$ is a bijection and $\theta|_{\mathcal{N}'}$ is G-equivariant by Lemma 4.3, where $\mathcal{N}'$(resp. $\mathcal{N}$) is the set of all nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}^*$(resp. $\mathfrak{g}$). The proposition follows.

5. SPRINGER CORRESPONDENCE FOR $\mathfrak{g}^*$

5.1. Let G be an adjoint algebraic group of type B, C or D over $\mathbf{k}$ ($\mathbf{k}$ algebraically closed) and $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. Let $\mathfrak{g}^*$ be the dual space of $\mathfrak{g}$. Fix a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$ and a maximal torus $T \subset B$. Let $B = T.U$ be the Levi decomposition of B. Let $\mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{n}$ and $\mathfrak{t}$ be the Lie algebra of B, U and T respectively. Let $\mathcal{B} = G/B$ be the variety of Borel subgroups in G. Let $\mathfrak{b}' = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* | \xi(\mathfrak{n}) = 0\}$ and $\mathfrak{n}' = \{\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^* | \xi(\mathfrak{b}) = 0\}$. Let $\mathcal{N}'$ be the set of all nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}^*$. Recall that in [7] we have map $\varphi : X = \{(x, gB) \in \mathfrak{g} \times G/B | \mathrm{Ad}(g^{-1})x \in \mathfrak{b}\} \to \mathfrak{g}$, $(x, gB) \mapsto x$. Define $\varphi' : X' = \{(\xi, gB) \in \mathfrak{g}^* \times G/B | g^{-1}.\xi \in \mathfrak{b}'\} \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, $(\xi, gB) \mapsto \xi$. Let $X'' = \{(\xi, gB) \in \mathfrak{g}^* \times G/B | g^{-1}.\xi \in \mathfrak{n}'\} \subset X'$. Define $\varphi'' : X'' \to \mathcal{N}'$ to be the restriction of φ' on X''. Fix a nontrivial character $\psi : \mathbf{F}_q \to \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l^*$, where $l \neq 2$ is prime.

Proposition 5.1. *We have* $T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/spec\mathbf{k}} \varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX}[\dim G] = i_{\mathcal{N}'*}\varphi''_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[\dim X''](-\dim B)$, *where* $i_{\mathcal{N}'} : \mathcal{N}' \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ *is the inclusion.*

Proof. We have $\varphi = p \circ i$, where $i : X \to \mathfrak{g} \times G/B$, $(x, gB) \mapsto (x, gB)$ and $p : \mathfrak{g} \times G/B \to G/B$, $(x, gB) \mapsto gB$. Similarly, $\varphi' = p' \circ i'$, where $i' : X' \to \mathfrak{g}^* \times G/B$, $(\xi, gB) \mapsto (\xi, gB)$ and $p' : \mathfrak{g}^* \times G/B \to G/B$, $(\xi, gB) \mapsto gB$. Thus $T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{spec}\mathbf{k}}(\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX}) = T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{spec}\mathbf{k}}(p_! i_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX}) = p'_! T_\psi^{\frac{\mathfrak{g} \times G/B}{G/B}} i_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX}$. We have $T_\psi^{\frac{\mathfrak{g} \times G/B}{G/B}} i_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX} = (i' \circ i'')_* \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[\dim \mathfrak{g} - 2\dim B](-\dim B)$ (see for example [4] Corollary 13.4), where $i'' : X'' \to X'$ is the inclusion. Notice we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X'' \arrow[r, "\varphi''"] \arrow[d, "i''"'] & \mathcal{N}' \arrow[d, "i_{\mathcal{N}'}"] & . \\
X' \arrow[d, "i'"'] & \mathfrak{g}^* \arrow[d, "id"] & \\
\mathfrak{g}^* \times G/B \arrow[r, "p'"] & \mathfrak{g}^* &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus $p'_!(i' \circ i'')_* \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[\dim \mathfrak{g} - 2\dim B](-\dim B) = i_{\mathcal{N}'*}\varphi''_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[\dim \mathfrak{g} - 2\dim B](-\dim B)$. The proposition follows from $\dim X'' = \dim \mathfrak{g} - 2\dim B$. $\square$

Let $Z = \{(\xi, B_1, B_2) \in \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} | \xi \in \mathfrak{b}'_1 \cap \mathfrak{b}'_2\}$ and $Z' = \{(\xi, B_1, B_2) \in \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} | \xi \in \mathfrak{n}'_1 \cap \mathfrak{n}'_2\}$. We have $Z = \cup_{\mathcal{O}} Z_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $Z' = \cup_{\mathcal{O}} Z'_{\mathcal{O}}$, where $\mathcal{O}$ runs through the orbits of G-action on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}$, $Z_{\mathcal{O}} = \{(\xi, B_1, B_2) \in Z | (B_1, B_2) \in \mathcal{O}\}$ and $Z'_{\mathcal{O}} = \{(\xi, B_1, B_2) \in Z' | (B_1, B_2) \in \mathcal{O}\}$. Given a G-orbit c' in $\mathcal{N}' \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$. Let $\xi \in \mathrm{c}'$.

Lemma 5.2. (i) $\dim Z = \dim \mathfrak{g}, \dim Z' = \dim \mathfrak{g} - r$.
(ii) $\dim\{B_1 \in \mathcal{B} | \xi \in \mathfrak{n}'_1\} \leq (\dim \mathfrak{g} - r - \dim \mathrm{c}')$.

Proof. (i) Consider $Z_{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$, $(\xi, B_1, B_2) \mapsto (B_1, B_2)$. We have $\dim Z_{\mathcal{O}} = \dim \mathcal{O} + \dim(\mathfrak{b}'_1 \cap \mathfrak{b}'_2) = \dim G - r - \dim(\mathfrak{n}_1 \cap \mathfrak{n}_2) + \dim(\mathfrak{b}_1 \cap \mathfrak{b}_2) = \dim G$. Similarly one proves $\dim Z'_{\mathcal{O}} = \dim G - r$. Then (i) follows.

(ii) Let $Z'(\mathrm{c}') = \{(\xi', B_1, B_2) \in Z' | \xi \in \mathrm{c}'\}$ and consider $Z'(\mathrm{c}') \to \mathrm{c}'$, $(\xi', B_1, B_2) \mapsto \xi'$. The fiber of $\xi \in \mathrm{c}'$ is $\{B_1 \in \mathcal{B} | \xi \in \mathfrak{n}'_1\} \times \{B_1 \in \mathcal{B} | \xi \in \mathfrak{n}'_1\}$. Thus it follows $2 \dim\{B \in \mathcal{B} | \xi \in \mathfrak{n}'\} = \dim Z'(\mathrm{c}') - \dim \mathrm{c}' \leq \dim Z' - \dim \mathrm{c}' = \dim G - r - \dim \mathrm{c}'$ and (ii) holds. ☐

Let $\mathfrak{A}'$ be the set of all pairs $(\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}')$ where c' is a G-orbit in $\mathcal{N}'$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ is a G-equivariant local system on c'. Note that the map φ'' is G-equivariant with G-action on X'' by $(\xi, gB) \mapsto (g_0.\xi, g_0 gB)$.

Proposition 5.3. *The G-equivariant sheaf $\varphi''_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[m](\frac{m}{2})$ is a semisimple perverse sheaf and it has decomposition*

$$\varphi''_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[m](\frac{m}{2}) = \bigoplus_{(\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}') \in \mathfrak{A}'} V_{\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}'} \otimes IC(\bar{\mathrm{c}}', \mathcal{F}')[\dim \mathrm{c}'] (\textit{extend by 0 on } \mathcal{N}' - \bar{\mathrm{c}}'),$$

where $m = \dim \mathcal{N}' = \dim G - r$.

Proof. We have that $\varphi'' : X'' \to \mathcal{N}'$ is proper and $\dim X'' = \dim \mathcal{N}'$. It follows from Lemma 5.2 that $\dim\{\xi \in \mathcal{N}' | 2 \dim \varphi''^{-1}(x) \geq i\} \leq \dim \mathcal{N}' - i$ for all $i > 0$. Thus φ'' is a semi-small map. Hence $\varphi''_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[m](\frac{m}{2})$ is a perverse sheaf on $\mathcal{N}'$. It is semisimple by the decomposition theorem([1]). Since it is G-equivariant and $\mathcal{N}'$ consists of finitely many G-orbits, it follows that it has the decomposition as in the proposition. ☐

Let $\hat{W}$ be the set of simple modules (up to isomorphism) for the Weyl group W of G. Recall that we have $\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX} = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \hat{W}} \rho \otimes (\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX})_\rho$.

Theorem 5.4. *For any $\rho \in \hat{W}$, there is a unique $(\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}') \in \mathfrak{A}'$ such that $T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/spec\mathbf{k}}(\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX})_\rho[n]$ is $IC(\bar{\mathrm{c}}', \mathcal{F}')[\dim \mathrm{c}'](-n)$ regarded as a simple perverse sheaf on $\mathfrak{g}^*$ (zero outside $\bar{\mathrm{c}}$), where $n = \dim G$. Moreover, $\rho \mapsto (\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}')$ is a injective map $\gamma : \hat{W} \to \mathfrak{A}'$.*

Proof. We have

$$T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{spec}\mathbf{k}}(\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX}) = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \hat{W}} \rho \otimes T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{spec}\mathbf{k}}(\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX})_\rho.$$

Note each $T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{spec}\mathbf{k}}(\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX})_\rho$ is a simple perverse sheaf on $\mathfrak{g}^*$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} T_\psi^{\mathfrak{g}/\mathrm{spec}\mathbf{k}}(\varphi_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX})[n] &= \varphi''_! \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_{lX''}[m](\frac{m}{2})(-n) \\ &= \bigoplus_{(\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}') \in \mathfrak{A}'} V_{\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}'} \otimes i_{\mathcal{N}' *} IC(\bar{\mathrm{c}}', \mathcal{F}')[\dim \mathrm{c}'](-n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the comparison of the two decompositions defines the injective map γ. ☐

5.2. Let G be a symplectic group or orthogonal group and $\mathfrak{g}$ be its Lie algebra. Let $\mathfrak{g}^*$ be the dual space of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let G_{ad} be the adjoint group of the same type as G. Let $\mathfrak{g}_{ad}$ be the Lie algebra of G_{ad} and $\mathfrak{g}^*_{ad}$ be the dual space of $\mathfrak{g}_{ad}$. We have that the number of nilpotent $G_{ad}(\mathbf{F}_q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}_{ad}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$ is equal to the number of nilpotent $G(\mathbf{F}_q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$.

Let $\mathfrak{A}'$ be the set of all pairs $(\mathrm{c}', \mathcal{F}')$ where c' is a nilpotent G-orbit in $\mathfrak{g}^*$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ is an irreducible G-equivariant local system on c' (up to isomorphism). Let $\mathfrak{A}'_{ad}$ be defined as in the introduction for G_{ad}. The same argument as in [7] shows that the number of elements in $\mathfrak{A}'$(resp. $\mathfrak{A}'_{ad}$) is equal to the number of nilpotent

$G(\mathbf{F}_q)$(resp. $G_{ad}(\mathbf{F}_q)$)-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$(resp. $\mathfrak{g}_{ad}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$)(for q large). It follows that the number of elements in $\mathfrak{A}'_{ad}$ is equal to the number of elements in $\mathfrak{A}'$.

Let $\hat{W}$ be the set of simple modules (up to isomorphism) for the Weyl group W of G. (A description of $\hat{W}$ is given for example in [6].)

Corollary 5.5. $|\mathfrak{A}'_{ad}|=|\mathfrak{A}'|=|\hat{W}|$.

Proof. For G even orthogonal group, this follows from the above argument, Proposition 4.1, and Corollary 6.18 in [7]. For G symplectic group or odd orthogonal group, it follows from Theorem 5.4 that this number is greater than $|\hat{W}|$. On the other hand, this number is less than $|\hat{W}|$ by Proposition 2.14, Proposition 3.19 and the above argument. $\square$

Corollary 5.6. *The map γ in Theorem 5.4 is a bijection.*

Corollary 5.7. *Proposition 2.12, Corollary 2.13, Proposition 2.14, Proposition 3.18 and Proposition 3.19 hold with all "at most" removed.*

Proof. This follows from the same argument as in the proof of Corollary 6.18 in [7](see Proposition 6.2 and 6.7). $\square$

6. CENTRALIZERS AND COMPONENT GROUPS

6.1. **Symplectic group.** Let $V=W_{\chi(m_1)}(m_1)\oplus W_{\chi(m_2)}(m_2)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{\chi(m_s)}(m_s)$, $m_1\geq\cdots\geq m_s$, be a form module corresponding to $\xi\in\mathfrak{g}^*$. Let T_ξ be defined as in subsection 2.1. Let $Z(V)=\{g\in GL(V)|\beta(gv,gw)=\beta(v,w),\alpha_\xi(gv)=\alpha_\xi(g),\ \forall\ v,w\in V\}$ be the centralizer of ξ in G.

Proposition 6.1. $\dim Z(V)=\sum_{i=1}^{s}((4i-1)m_i-2\chi(m_i))$.

Proof. We argue by induction on s. The case $s=1$ can be easily verified. Let $C(V)=\{g\in GL(V)\mid gT_\xi=T_\xi g\}$. Let $V_1=W_{\chi(m_1)}(m_1)$ and $V_2=W_{\chi(m_2)}(m_2)\oplus\cdots\oplus W_{\chi(m_s)}(m_s)$. Consider V_1 as an element in the Grassmannian variety $Gr(V,2m_1)$ and consider the action of $C(V)$ on $Gr(V,2m_1)$. Then the orbit of V_1 has dimension $\dim\mathrm{Hom}_A(V_1,V_2)=4\sum_{i=2}^{s}m_i$. Consider now the action of $Z(V)$ on $Gr(V,2m_1)$. The orbit $Z(V)V_1$ is open dense in $C(V)V_1$ and thus has dimension $4\sum_{i=2}^{s}m_i$. We claim that

(*) the stabilizer of V_1 in $Z(V)$ is the product of $Z(V_1)$ and $Z(V_2)$.

Thus $\dim Z(V)=\dim Z(V_1)+\dim Z(V_2)+\dim Z(V)V_1=3m_1-2\chi(m_1)+\sum_{i=2}^{s}((4i-5)m_i-2\chi(m_i))+4\sum_{i=2}^{s}m_i=\sum_{i=1}^{s}((4i-1)m_i-2\chi(m_i))$ using induction hypothesis.

Proof of (*): Assume $g:V_1\oplus V_2\to V_1\oplus V_2$ lies in the stabilizer of V_1 in $Z(V)$. Let p_{ij}, $i,j=1,2$ be the obvious projection composed with g. Then $p_{12}=0$. We claim p_{11} is non-singular. It is enough to show p_{11} is injective. Assume $p_{11}(v_1)=0$ for some $v_1\in V_1$. Then we have $\beta(gv_1,gv_1')=\beta(p_{11}v_1,gv_1')=0=\beta(v_1,v_1')$ for any $v_1'\in V_1$. Since $\beta|_{V_1}$ is non-degenerate, we get $v_1=0$. Now for any $v_2\in V_2,v_1\in V_1$, we have $\beta(gv_1,gv_2)=\beta(p_{11}v_1,p_{21}v_2+p_{22}v_2)=\beta(p_{11}v_1,p_{21}v_2)=\beta(v_1,v_2)=0$. Again by non-degeneracy of β on V_1 and p_{11} being bijective on V_1, we get $p_{21}(v_2)=0$. Then (*) follows. $\square$

Let $r=\#\{1\leq i\leq s|\chi(m_i)+\chi(m_{i+1})<m_i \text{ and } \chi(m_i)>\frac{m_i-1}{2}\}$.

Proposition 6.2. *The component group $Z(V)/Z^0(V)$ is $\mathbb{Z}_2^r$.*

Proof. Assume q large enough. Same argument as in the proof of Proposition 7.1 in [7] shows that $Z(V)/Z^0(V)$ is an abelian group of order 2^r. We show there is a subgroup $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^r \subset Z(V)/Z(V)^0$. Thus $Z(V)/Z(V)^0$ has to be $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^r$. Let $1 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_r \leq s$ be such that $\chi(m_{i_j}) > (m_{i_j}-1)/2$ and $\chi(m_{i_j}) + \chi(m_{i_j+1}) < m_{i_j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, r$. Let $V_j = (m_{i_{j-1}+1})^2_{\chi(m_{i_{j-1}+1})} \cdots (m_{i_j})^2_{\chi(m_{i_j})}$, $j = 1, \ldots, r-1$, where $i_0 = 0$, and $V_r = (m_{i_{r-1}+1})^2_{\chi(m_{i_{r-1}+1})} \cdots (m_s)^2_{\chi(m_s)}$. Then $V = V_1 \oplus V_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_r$. We have $Z(V_i)/Z^0(V_i) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Take $g_i \in Z(V_i)$ such that $g_i Z^0(V_i)$ generates $Z(V_i)/Z^0(V_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Let $\tilde{g}_i = Id \oplus \cdots \oplus g_i \oplus \cdots \oplus Id$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Then we have $\tilde{g}_i \in Z(V)$ and $\tilde{g}_i \notin Z^0(V)$. We also have the images of $\tilde{g}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{g}_{i_p}$'s, $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_p \leq r$, $p = 1, \ldots, r$, in $Z(V)/Z^0(V)$ are not equal to each other. Moreover $\tilde{g}_i^2 \in Z^0(V)$. Thus the $\tilde{g}_i Z^0(V)$'s generates a subgroup $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^r$ in $Z(V)/Z^0(V)$. □

6.2. **Odd orthogonal group.** Let (V, α, β_ξ) be a form module corresponding to $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Assume the corresponding pair of partitions is $(\nu_0, \ldots, \nu_s)(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_s)$. Let $C(V) = \{g \in GL(V) | \beta(gv, gw) = \beta(v, w), \beta_\xi(gv, gw) = \beta_\xi(v, w), \ \forall\ v, w \in V\}$ and $Z(V) = \{g \in C(V) | \alpha(gv) = \alpha(v), \ \forall\ v \in V\}$.

Lemma 6.3. *$|Z(V_{2m+1})(\boldsymbol{F}_q)| = q^m$ and $|C(V_{2m+1})(\boldsymbol{F}_q)| = q^{2m+1}$.*

Proof. Let $V_{2m+1} = \operatorname{span}\{v_0, \cdots, v_m, u_0, \cdots, u_{m-1}\}$, where v_i, u_i are chosen as in Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. Let $g \in C(V_{2m+1})$. Then $g : V_{2m+1} \to V_{2m+1}$ satisfies $g^t S g = S$ and $g^t X_\xi g = X_\xi$. Since $(X_\xi + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^m v_i \lambda^i = 0$, we have $(X_\xi + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^m g v_i \lambda^i = (g^t)^{-1} (X_\xi + \lambda S) \sum_{i=0}^m v_i \lambda^i = 0$. This implies $\sum_{i=0}^m g v_i \lambda^i = a \sum_{i=0}^m v_i \lambda^i$ for some $a \in \mathbf{F}_q^*$. Namely we have $g v_i = a v_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, m$. Assume $g u_i = \sum_{k=0}^m a_{ik} v_k + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} b_{ik} u_k$. We have $\beta(g v_i, g u_j) = a b_{ji} = \beta(v_i, u_j) = \delta_{i,j}$, $\beta(g u_i, g u_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} a(a_{ik} b_{jk} + b_{ik} a_{jk}) = a(a_{ij} + a_{ji}) = \beta(u_i, u_j) = 0$, $\beta_\xi(g v_{i+1}, g u_j) = a b_{ji} = \beta_\xi(v_{i+1}, u_j) = \delta_{i,j}$ and $\beta_\xi(g u_i, g u_j) = \sum_{k=1}^m a(a_{ik} b_{j,k-1} + b_{i,k-1} a_{jk}) = a(a_{i,j+1} + a_{j,i+1}) = \beta(u_i, u_j) = 0$. Thus we get $g v_i = a v_i, i = 0, \ldots, m$, and $g u_i = u_i/a + \sum_{j=0}^m a_{ij} v_j$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$, where $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$, $a_{i,j+1} = a_{j,i+1}$, $0 \leq i, j \leq m-1$. Hence $|C(V_{2m+1})(\mathbf{F}_q)| = q^{2m+1}$.

Now assume $g \in Z(V_{2m+1})$. Then we have additional conditions $\alpha(g v_i) = a^2 \alpha(v_i) = \alpha(v_i) = \delta_{i,m} \Rightarrow a = 1$ and $\alpha(g u_i) = \alpha(u_i/a + \sum_{j=0}^m a_{ij} v_j) = a_{im}^2 + a_{ii}/a = \alpha(u_i) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$. Hence $|Z(V_{2m+1})(\mathbf{F}_q)| = q^m$. □

Assume $V = V_{2m+1} \oplus W$ as in Lemma 3.8.

Lemma 6.4. *$|C(V)(\boldsymbol{F}_q)| = |C(V_{2m+1})(\boldsymbol{F}_q)| \cdot |C(W)(\boldsymbol{F}_q)| \cdot q^{\dim W}$.*

Proof. Let $g \in C(V)$. Let $p_{11} : V_{2m+1} \to V_{2m+1}, p_{12} : V_{2m+1} \to W$, $p_{21} : W \to V_{2m+1}$ and $p_{22} : W \to W$ be the projections composed with g. Let v_i, u_i be the basis of V_{2m+1} as before. By the same argument as in Lemma 3.9, we have $g v_i = a v_i$ for some a and $p_{22} \in C(W)$. Let $w \in W$. Assume $g u_i = \sum_{j=0}^m a_{ij} v_j + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} b_{ij} u_j + p_{12}(u_i)$. We have $\beta(v_i, u_j) = \beta(g v_i, g u_j) = a b_{ji} = \delta_{i,j}$, thus $b_{ji} = \delta_{i,j}/a$. Now $\beta(g v_i, g w) = \beta(v_i, w) = 0$ implies $p_{21}(w) = \sum_{i=0}^m b_i^w v_i$. Thus $\beta(g u_i, g w) = \beta(p_{12}(u_i), p_{22}(w)) + b_i^w/a = 0$ and $\beta_\xi(g u_i, g w) = \beta_\xi(p_{12}(u_i), p_{22}(w)) + b_{i+1}^w/a = 0$. This gives us $b_i^w = a\beta(p_{12}(u_i), p_{22}(w))$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1, b_i^w = a\beta_\xi(p_{12}(u_{i-1}), p_{22}(w))$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Thus $\beta_\xi(p_{12}(u_{i-1}), p_{22}(w)) = \beta(p_{12}(u_i), p_{22}(w))$, $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$. This holds for any $w \in W$. Recall on W, $\beta_\xi(p_{12}(u_{i-1}), p_{22}(w)) = \beta(T_\xi p_{12}(u_{i-1}), p_{22}(w))$. Since p_{22} is nonsingular and $\beta|_{W \times W}$ is nondegenerate, we get $p_{12}(u_i) = T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0)$, $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$, and $b_i^w = a\beta(T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0), p_{22} w)$.

Hence we get $gv_i = av_i, i = 0,\dots,m, gu_i = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_{ij}v_j + u_i/a + T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0),\ i = 0,\dots,m-1, gw = \sum_{i=0}^{m} a\beta(T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0), p_{22}w)v_i + p_{22}(w),\ \forall\ w \in W$. Now note that $p_{12}(u_0)$ can be any vector in W. It is easily verified that lemma holds. □

Proposition 6.5. $\dim Z(V) = \nu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\nu_i(4i+1) + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\mu_i(4i-1)$.

Proof. Let $V = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}(m_s) = (V, \alpha, \beta_\xi)$. Let $W = W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}(m_s)$. We have $\dim C(W) = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(4i-1)m_i$ and $\dim C(V_{2m+1}) = 2m+1$. By Lemma 6.4, $\dim C(V) = \dim C(W) + \dim V_{2m+1} + \dim W = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(4i-1)m_i + 2m + 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{s} m_i$. Consider V_{2m+1} as an element in the Grassmannian variety $Gr(V, 2m+1)$. Let $C(V)V_{2m+1}$ be the orbit of V_{2m+1} under the action of $C(V)$. The stabilizer of V_{2m+1} in $C(V)$ is the product of $C(V_{2m+1})$ and $C(W)$. Hence $\dim C(V)V_{2m+1} = \dim C(V) - \dim C(V_{2m+1}) - \dim C(W) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{s} m_i$. We have $\dim Z(V)V_{2m+1} = \dim C(V)V_{2m+1}$. Hence $\dim Z(V) = \dim Z(V_{2m+1}) + \dim Z(W) + \dim Z(V)V_{2m+1} = m + \sum_{i=1}^{s}((4i+1)m_i - 2l_i) = \nu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\nu_i(4i+1) + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\mu_i(4i-1)$. □

Lemma 6.6. *$|Z(V)(\boldsymbol{F}_q)| = 2^k q^{\dim Z(V)}+$ lower terms, where $k = \#\{i \geq 1 | \nu_i < \mu_i \leq \nu_{i-1}\}$.*

Proof. If $\#\{i \geq 1 | \nu_i < \mu_i \leq \nu_{i-1}\}$=0, assertion follows from the classification of orbits. Assume $1 \leq t \leq s$ be the minimal integer such that $\nu_t < \mu_t \leq \nu_{t-1}$. Let $V_1 = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_1$ where $W_1 = W_{l_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_{t-1}}(m_{t-1})$ and $W_2 = W_{l_t}(m_t) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}(m_s)$. We show that

$$|Z(V)(\mathbf{F}_q)| = |Z(V_1)(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot |Z(W_2)(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot q^{r_1}, \tag{3}$$

where $r_1 = \dim W_2 + \dim \mathrm{Hom}_A(W_1, W_2)$. Again consider V_1 as an element in the Grassmannian variety $Gr(V, \dim V_1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |C(V)V_1(\mathbf{F}_q)| &= \frac{|C(V)(\mathbf{F}_q)|}{|C(V_1)(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot |C(W_2)(\mathbf{F}_q)|} \\ &= \frac{|C(V_{2m+1})(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot |C(W_1 \oplus W_2)(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot q^{\dim(W_1+W_2)}}{|C(V_{2m+1})(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot |C(W_1)(\mathbf{F}_q)| \cdot q^{\dim(W_1)} \cdot |C(W_2)(\mathbf{F}_q)|} = q^{r_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In fact, let $p_{ij},\ i,j = 1,2,3$ be the projections of $g \in C(V)$. Assume g is in the stabilizer of V_1 in $C(V)$. Then we have $p_{13} = p_{23} = 0$. Same argument as in Lemma 6.4 shows p_{22} is nonsingular and we have $gv_i = av_i, i = 0,\dots,m,\ \ gu_i = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_{ij}v_j + u_i/a + T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0),\ i = 0,\dots,m-1, gw_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{m} a\beta(T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0), p_{22}w_1)v_i + p_{22}(w_1),\ \forall\ w_1 \in W_1, gw_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{m} a\beta(T_\xi^i p_{12}(u_0), p_{22}w_2 + p_{23}w_2)v_i + p_{22}(w_2) + p_{23}(w_2),\ \forall\ w_2 \in W_2$. Now $\beta(gw_1, gw_2) = \beta(p_{22}(w_1), p_{22}(w_2) + p_{23}(w_2)) = \beta(p_{22}(w_1), p_{22}(w_2)) = 0$, for any $w_1 \in W_1$ and $w_2 \in W_2$. Since p_{22} is nonsingular and $\beta|_{W_1 \times W_1}$ is nondegenerate, we get $p_{22}(w_2) = 0$ for any $w_2 \in W_2$. Thus the stabilizer of V_1 in $C(V)$ is the product of $C(V_1)$ and $C(W_2)$ and (4) follows. As before, we have $C(V)(V_1 \oplus W_2) \cong C(V)(V_1) \oplus C(V)(W_2)$ implies $C(V)(V_1) \cong V_1$ and $C(V)(W_2) \cong W_2$. Thus $|C(V)(V_1)(\mathbf{F}_q)| = |Z(V)V_1(\mathbf{F}_q)| = q^{r_1}$. Since the stabilizer of V_1 in $Z(V)$ is the product of $Z(V_1)$ and $Z(W_2)$, (3) follows. Now lemma follows by induction hypothesis since we have $\dim Z(V) = \dim Z(V_1) + \dim Z(W_2) + r_1$. □

Proposition 6.7. *The component group $Z(V)/Z^0(V)$ is $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^k$, where $k = \#\{i \geq 1 | \nu_i < \mu_i \leq \nu_{i-1}\}$.*

Proof. Lemma 6.6 and the classification of nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{g}(\mathbf{F}_q)^*$($q$ large) show that $Z(V)/Z^0(V)$ is an abelian group of order 2^k. It is enough to show that there exists a subgroup $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^k \subset Z(V)/Z^0(V)$. Assume $V = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}^{\epsilon_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_s}^{\epsilon_s}(m_s)$. Let $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k$ be the i's such that $\nu_i < \mu_i \leq \nu_{i-1}$. Let $V_0 = V_{2m+1} \oplus W_{l_1}^{\epsilon_1}(m_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_{i_1-1}}^{\epsilon_{i_1-1}}(m_{i_1-1})$ and $W_j = W_{l_{i_j}}^{\epsilon_{i_j}}(m_{i_j}) \oplus \cdots \oplus W_{l_{i_{j+1}-1}}^{\epsilon_{i_{j+1}-1}}(m_{i_{j+1}-1})$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$, where $i_{k+1} = s+1$. We have $Z(V_0)/Z^0(V_0) = \{1\}$ and $Z(W_j)/Z^0(W_j) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Suppose $g_j \in Z(W_j)$ such that $g_j Z^0(W_j)$ generates $Z(W_j)/Z^0(W_j)$. Let $\tilde{g}_j = Id \oplus \cdots \oplus g_j \oplus \cdots \oplus Id$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Then $\tilde{g}_j \in Z(V)$, $\tilde{g}_j \notin Z^0(V)$, $\tilde{g}_j^2 \in Z^0(V)$ and $\tilde{g}_{j_1}\tilde{g}_{j_2} \cdots \tilde{g}_{j_r} \notin Z^0(V)$ for any $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_r \leq s$, $r = 1, \ldots, k$. Thus $\tilde{g}_j Z^0(W_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$ generate a subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2^k$. $\square$

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Professor George Lusztig for his guidance, encouragement and help during this research.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein and P. Deligne, Faisceaux pervers. Asterisque 100(1981).

[2] W.H. Hesselink, Nilpotency in Classical Groups over a Field of Characteristic 2. Math. Z. 166(1979), 165-181.

[3] V. Kac, B. Weisfeiler, Coadjoint action of a semi-simple algebraic group and the center of the enveloping algebra in characteristic p. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 79=Indag. Math. 38(1976), no. 2, 136-151.

[4] R. Kiehl, R. Weissauer, Weil conjectures, perverse sheaves and l'adic Fourier transform. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, 42. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. xii+375 pp. ISBN: 3-540-41457-6.

[5] D.B. Leep, L.M. Schueller, Classification of pairs of symmetric and alternating bilinear forms. Exposition. Math. 17(1999), no. 5, 385-414.

[6] G. Lusztig, A class of irreducible representations of a Weyl group. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Indag. Math. 41(1979), no. 3, 323-335.

[7] T. Xue, Nilpotent orbits in classical Lie algebras over F_{2^n} and the Springer correspondence.(2008) arXiv:0808.2995.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139, USA

E-mail address: `txue@math.mit.edu`